

THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by Canon E. G. SELWYN, D.D., REDHILL RECTORY, ROWLANDS CASTLE,
HANTS, to whom all editorial matters should be addressed.

Vol. XIX

NOVEMBER, 1929

No. 113

EDITORIAL

SOUTH INDIA AND LAMBETH

WE published in the August and September numbers of this Journal two opinions on the South India Reunion proposals, from the Rev. E. R. Morgan and the Rev. L. E. Browne respectively, the first critical and the second favourable; and we promised at the time to return to the matter in due course. Since then an important statement has been put out by Bishop Gore, Professor Turner, the Master of Corpus, and others, containing a considered criticism of the proposals from the Catholic standpoint; and this has been replied to by Bishop Palmer, late of Bombay, who writes* "as a Catholic" in support of the scheme for which he has laboured so devotedly. Several other representative opinions have also been expressed on the issue; and it must be remembered that there is a considerable volume of opposition to the proposals, as well as of support for them, in Nonconformist circles. But so far as the Anglican Communion is concerned, those which we have mentioned would seem to cover the main points of the problem.

The proposals themselves are published by the Christian Literature Society for India under the title of *Proposed Scheme of Union Prepared by the Joint Committee of the Church of India, Burma, and Ceylon, The South India United Church, and the South India Provincial Synod of the Wesleyan Methodist Church, for Presentation to the Governing Bodies of those Churches in India and Elsewhere*. The pamphlet runs to about seventy pages, and contains an instructive map. The title is itself informative. The scheme is the work of a Joint Committee, and has only the authority of that Committee. It has yet to be presented to the governing bodies of the Churches concerned, and is presumably open to their criticism and even to modification before it is accepted. In the case of the Wesleyan Methodist Church we understand that the scheme could not be endorsed

* *Church Times*, September 20, 1929.

without reference to England. On the Anglican side the governing body of the Church of India is the body that can authorize the scheme to be proceeded with: but, before it does so, the opinion of the Lambeth Conference will be asked, and its support and criticisms invited. The immediate task before Church people at home is to inform themselves as to the character of the proposals, so that an intelligent public opinion may surround the Lambeth Conference and also influence whatever action may afterwards be taken by the Provinces of the English Church.

Something should be said first as to the existing condition of the bodies now proposing to unite. (1) The South India United Church (S.I.U.C.) is itself the fruit of a union, which gradually materialized in the years 1905-18, between Congregational, Presbyterian, and Lutheran bodies: it numbers 182,000 baptized members, of whom about 44,000 are communicants.* The Wesleyans number 100,000 baptized members, of whom 17,000 are communicants. The four Anglican dioceses concerned comprise 334,500 baptized members, of whom 106,000 are communicants. It will thus be seen that the number of Anglican communicants is over half as large again as those of the other two bodies put together. The fact is important as suggesting that there should be no fear of Catholic principles and traditions, provided that they are faithfully vindicated by the Anglican elements in the proposed fusion, going by default in the new Church. At the same time the Anglican missions in the area affected by the proposals tend to be mainly of a C.M.S. type, and Lambeth may well desire to assure itself as to the sense in which certain things are understood. (2) Again, it is worth noting that, unlike certain other parts of the Indian Church, the Christianity of South India appears to be free from Unitarian or Modernist errors regarding the Incarnation. The worship of our Lord is central to it, and is the spontaneous expression of its devotional life. Bishop Palmer has pleaded that we should recognize in this fact a providential preparation of the soil for the sowing of Reunion. (3) The *Church Times* of September 27, 1929, published extracts from an exceedingly instructive semi-official document called "The Church Member's Manual of the South India United Church." Much of the teaching in this document is quite incompatible with Catholic or Anglican principles. Yet that is

* All the figures (to the nearest thousand) are taken from the statistical table in Appendix B of the "Proposals." "Membership" in the new Church is to be confined to those who have been baptized, but only "adult communicant members" are to have "the privilege of participation in the government" of it. It is instructive to note that the proportion of communicants to baptized persons is in the case of the Anglican body 31.7 per cent., of the Wesleyans 17 per cent., and of the S.I.U.C. 24.2.

not perhaps the most significant fact about it. What strikes us as most significant is the almost pathetic crudity, if not childishness, of the document. In its curious juxtaposition of the important and the trivial, and in its complete lack of any first-hand thinking, it reminds us of the *Didache*. At once sententious and controversial, it embodies a type of religious teaching which carries its transitoriness on its face; and in a reunited Church we conceive that this kind of thing would quickly sink into the background.

The main principles of the scheme are sufficiently well known to need only a short summary. They include acceptance of the Scriptures as the ultimate standard of faith and of the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds as its witness and safeguard; the belief that the two sacraments of the Gospel are "means of grace through which God works in us"; and the recognition of a gift of God given in Ordination to the Ministry. It is agreed that, after union, all future ordinations shall be at the hands of bishops (supported by the presbytery), and it is the "intention and expectation" of the uniting bodies that only those episcopally ordained will eventually exercise a permanent ministry in the Church. But during the next thirty years all existing ministers will be recognized and sanctioned in the exercise of their present functions; and the new Church desires that the existing "relations of communion and fellowship" which any of the uniting bodies now enjoys with other bodies shall continue. The new Church will constitute a new province of the Catholic Church, and will, it is hoped, be recognized as such by the governing body of the Church of India, Burma, and Ceylon.

One of the first points that strikes one about the scheme is that it is exceedingly difficult to criticize. It arises, not from any theory, but from the practical urgencies of the Mission Field; and it is therefore not easy to set it beside any of the usual canons of Reunion, and say, "Here—or there—it transgresses vital principles of Christian order or belief." We propose in the following paragraphs to consider (a) certain points where the Lambeth Conference would have to require modification before it could commend the scheme; (b) certain other points where Lambeth could do much by way of interpretation; and (c) the kind of authority which in a matter of this kind the Lambeth Conference possesses.

(a) POINTS FOR MODIFICATION.—These concern particularly the sacraments of Baptism and the Eucharist. The statement of belief as to these expressed in "The Basis of Union" (Section

III. [A]) is not satisfactory as it stands, since it leaves the way open for a very casual attitude as to their value. Such words as "They accept the sacraments of Baptism and the Supper of the Lord, ordained by Christ Himself, as the normal means of grace through which God works in us," would seem necessary, if Anglican standards are not to be seriously compromised. When we pass to particulars, it is gratifying to note that only baptized persons can be members of the new Church (Section VI., 1, 2): but widespread misgiving has been caused by the policy adopted in regard to Confirmation. We share those misgivings, but we are not sure that criticism has been directed to the right point. In the proposals Confirmation is regarded as the typically Anglican rite of admission to Communion, and is given a parallel status—but only a parallel status—with similar rites of admission in the other bodies. We see the difficulty of securing any other place for Confirmation, if it is approached along those lines. But, as Bishop Palmer has pointed out, that conception of Confirmation is characteristically Anglican, and has by no means universal authority. The older and more Catholic conception is that Confirmation is the completion of Baptism: in the East it is still, as it was in the early centuries, a part of the baptismal rite. The Lambeth Conference would surely be fully entitled to ask that, in this new province of the Church which is endeavouring to constitute itself upon lines acknowledged as primitive and free from what some regard as the accretions of later ages, the primitive custom of the full baptismal rite,* which includes either the chrism or the laying on of hands, shall also be established. Anglicans no less than Nonconformists would then be asked to make a change—a change, moreover, which would assimilate them to the Old Syrian Church which is the oldest in India. Further, it would not be necessary that Confirmation should be administered by a bishop. Even today, in the Roman Church, a priest can administer Confirmation to adults by papal dispensation; while, where the rite is combined with Baptism, the minister of the one part of the rite if a priest would also naturally be the minister of the other. Theologically such a restoration of primitive custom would be of great advantage. Not only is it scriptural, but the laying on of hands represents, as Baptism alone does not, the incorporation of the individual in the regenerate community, and this is the aspect of the great rite of Initiation which is most in keeping with current needs. At the same time the practical and pastoral value of a solemn rite of admission to Communion could be met, as already among Nonconformist bodies, in other ways.

* We hope to publish shortly an article on this aspect of Confirmation by Professor N. P. Williams.

A further point occurs in regard to the Holy Communion. It is, in our judgment, a point of most serious moment, and we are surprised to have seen no allusion to it as yet in the discussion of the scheme. We refer to Section IX. (B), which contains a summary of the "constituent parts" of the Communion Service. They are (1) Introductory Prayers, (2) The Ministry of the Word, (3) The Offering to God of the Gifts of the People, (4) The Preparation of the Communicants, (5) The Thanksgiving (with the suggestion that the *Sursum Corda* and *Sanctus* should be used), (6) An Intercession for the whole Church, (7) The Lord's Prayer, (8) "The Administration of the Communion, with words conformable to Scripture indicating the nature of the action," (9) A Thanksgiving for the Grace received in the Communion. The Anglican reader will at once notice that *there is no Prayer of Consecration*. One may presume that the Anglican negotiators intended clause (6)—the Intercession—to be understood as including such a prayer, though it is not clear whether our Lord's words of institution are reckoned to belong there or in clause (8). Nor is any mention made of the manual acts. The fact remains that the expression of any intention to consecrate the bread and wine to be the matter of the Sacrament is simply omitted. We cannot regard this as accidental. We cannot but suppose that it is intended to provide—and to provide by an explicit silence—for the more extreme (but not uncommon) Protestant view that there is no consecration of the elements. And the result, in our view, is a liturgy so defective as to invalidate the Sacrament so administered. We believe that when the Church celebrates the Holy Eucharist with intent to do what our Lord did and commanded, He will bless and accept the deed. Such intent is presumed from the forms used and must be expressed in it. When it is not expressed, such intent cannot fail to be doubtful. This means that, if this section of the scheme stands, not only are Catholic and Anglican standards (with their clear emphasis on a formula of consecration) departed from, but that no one in the reunited body will be able to know whether or not the sacred tokens he receives have, or have not been, consecrated.

We have mentioned two points where it seems to us that the Lambeth Conference must require modification in the proposals before it can give them any kind of approval. Of the two, the second is the more important and admits of no delay. The conditions of a valid Eucharist (quite apart from any question of the minister) cannot be said to be observed, merely because at some point or other in the liturgy the Lord's words of institution are recited. As the scheme stands at present, doubt will exist

as to the validity of either Sacrament. In the case of Baptism, this will be the result of historical rather than doctrinal causes, and time may be needed for assimilation of a new point of view. In the case of the Eucharist, the cause is probably doctrinal, though possibly not consciously so. In either case we cannot conceive that the Lambeth Conference could fail to regard modification as essential before the right hand of fellowship could be extended to the new body.

(b) POINTS FOR INTERPRETATION.—It is possible that Lambeth might do something to mitigate the impression made by some features of the proposals by laying its own interpretation upon ambiguous points. Where much depends on the construction put upon a word or clause in a scheme, authority is entitled to put the best construction on it, and say that it understands the word or clause in that sense; and that its adherence to it, such as it is, rests upon that construction being accepted by those who desire authority's support. We suggest that the omission from the proposals of the word "priest" might be dealt with in this way. It is an old saying that "priest is but presbyter writ small"; and if the Lambeth Conference said that it understood Section VII. (C) and (D) to refer to the priesthood under another name, and that it was the intention of the South Indian Church to ordain men to the priesthood of the Catholic Church, the omission would be largely robbed of its sting. A similar method might be used to protect Anglican congregations from the ministration at the altar of those not episcopally ordained. The General Council of the Church of India laboured for a rule to this effect; but in the final form of the proposals we find only a general promise not to override consciences or transgress long-standing traditions. Matters cannot be left there. In Section IV. (B) (3) we read: "The complete spiritual unity within the Church in South India, which is the aim of the uniting Churches, will not be attained till all the members of the united Church are willing and wishful to receive communion equally in all its churches, and it is the resolve of the uniting Churches to do all in their power to that end." Obviously this clause might be appealed to by those who wished Anglican congregations to abandon any stiffness on this issue. Lambeth would appear to have two duties here: first, to make it plain that for us this is a matter of Church order and not of congregational or individual conscience, and that it will look to the bishops of the new body to make this clear; and, secondly, that it understands the second paragraph of Section IV. (B) (3), as definitely intended to safeguard the Catholic tradition on this point.

Yet a further point might be dealt with in this way. The Lambeth Conference of 1920 resolved not to question the action of bishops who permitted certain irregularities of Church order "in the few years between the initiation and the completion of a definite scheme of union." The irregularities contemplated in the South India proposals go considerably beyond those envisaged in the Lambeth Report of 1920; the "few years" have become thirty; and the "completion" of the scheme will mean the consideration of "exceptions to the general principle of an episcopally ordained ministry." Unless the Lambeth Conference is to change its policy, it must insist that it takes a serious view of the "intention and expectation" expressed in Section IV. (B) (6), as to the rule of an episcopally ordained ministry in the new Church, and that it will look to see the intention realized and the rule observed.

(c) **THE AUTHORITY OF THE LAMBETH CONFERENCE.**—It is important that the nature and limits of the authority of the Lambeth Conference should be borne in mind during the coming months.* So far as we understand it, the basis of its authority is consensual, not canonical; it is a consultative, but not an executive, body; it recommends, but cannot require. This does not mean that a judgment of the Lambeth Conference does not carry great weight, and may not have great consequences, for good or for ill, on the Anglican Communion. But it does mean that the authority and responsibility of the Lambeth Conference, in regard to proposals such as those before us, are perhaps less direct and immediate than has sometimes been remembered. Since the basis of its authority is consensual, its primary task would appear to be to retain the confidence of its constituent provinces, and promote the harmony of the whole Communion which it represents. The abandonment of any Catholic principle by the Lambeth Conference would be an event of great gravity; but when we consider the character of some, at least, of the provinces of our Communion, it becomes most unlikely that such a step would be taken. In the case before us, the Lambeth Conference cannot, it would appear, take responsibility for the South India scheme, even if it would. The most it can do is to advise the Indian bishops on what points they should press for modification, and to advise the President of the Conference what the conditions are under which the Bishops of South India should be invited to the next Conference.

* The present writer knows of no adequate treatment of the subject. It is not alluded to, for instance, in Archbishop Lowther Clarke's massive and detailed work, *Constitutional Church Government*.

In other words, the duty of the Lambeth Conference is to the whole before the part, to the Anglican Communion before the Church in South India. The attitude imposed upon it towards South India would seem to be one of kindly and critical vigilance—not closing any doors of hope or quenching any smoking flax, but equally not compromising in the slightest degree any of those Catholic principles on which Anglicanism rests. The result may be that South India fails to meet Lambeth's criticisms and still proceeds with its scheme. And that might be the best result. It would mean that the province of South India passed into schism in order to achieve Reunion; but the schism might prove to be only temporary, and a local schism would, at any rate, be far better than a wholesale loosening of the bonds of union between the different provinces of our Communion. "We will not condemn," Lambeth might say, "but we cannot approve. You have not as yet met our criticisms, but perhaps time is needed before that is possible. You assure us that you are working towards a state of things which is wholly in keeping with Catholic principles. Very well, then, be it so; and when that conformity is reached, we shall rejoice to recognize in what you have done the guiding hand of God. But meanwhile you cannot expect us to bring into any jeopardy those very principles of Church order which you say that you at the end intend to embody and to live by."

If such an attitude were adopted, and if the South India scheme went through, the flank of one of its gravest objections would seem to be turned. The Church of England could no longer be said to be in communion with a body which was also in communion with a number of non-episcopal bodies. Individual Church people, and perhaps even a majority of the Evangelical school, would support the new Church, but that would not compromise Anglicanism. The whole issue of the nature and conditions of "communion" between different branches of the Church is one of extreme complexity, and it is conceivable that the South India experiment, if it were proceeded with, might place the problem in a new light in the course of a generation. But in all these matters we need to be patient, and to bear in mind not only the words of Scripture, "Hold fast that which thou hast, that no man take thy crown," but also the wise maxim of faith, "Leave something to God."

E. G. SELWYN.

WHAT IS A MYSTIC?

I.—THE APPROACH TO MYSTICAL EXPERIENCE

THERE are three main types of religious consciousness and three main ways by which a man according to his "bent" may seek God and get nearer to Him. These ways are the way of the intellect, the way of institutions, and the way of experience.

THE WAY OF THE INTELLECT.—This is the way of apprehending spiritual truths and shaping one's life accordingly by a process of reflection, and logical reasoning. Most of us are not guided to God, nor do we guide our own lives, by pure logical reasoning. We most of us begin by copying other people and accepting their ideas, and throughout our lives are mainly prompted by our feelings and tastes, and only checked now and then by our reason. Indeed, there are few who are sufficiently conscious of their own motives, or sufficiently detached from that great moulder of character that we call "public opinion," or sufficiently trained in the way of pure reasoning, to reach a belief in God and to apprehend the truths of His nature, and their personal relationship to Him, by a process of pure thinking. Nevertheless though they are rare, there are souls who can do this, and often for them it is the only way. They seek truth for its own sake. By their single-hearted devotion to the cause of truth and by an exclusive concentration upon their search, they do acquire that strong self-discipline, that purity of heart, and that detachment from material and selfish pleasures that we recognize as one of the characteristics of holiness in the characters of the great saints.

As often as not such a soul will sit loosely to Church observances, and he may very likely spend years of his life in a state of doubt, not careless doubt or profane doubt, which many people adopt as a cloak for spiritual idleness or disobedience, but simply because his beliefs are being very gradually adapted and modified as he learns more and more of the truth concerning God. His ideas remain fluid instead of crystallized. It is a fatal mistake to try and squeeze such a soul into the harness of Institutional Religion, or blame him because he has not reached a high state of prayer. Such a soul is in process of finding God. Nevertheless this type of religious consciousness, if genuine, is rare.

WAY OF INSTITUTIONS.—For ordinary people, particularly young people, busy people, uneducated people, over-imaginative or unimaginative people, simple, plain people, it is best to seek God and worship Him in what is called the way of Institutional

Religion—that is, to accept the doctrine of God as revealed through Christ in His Church, and to grow in the spirit by the rightful use of its sacraments, by participation in its ceremonies and devotions, and by the practice of such prayer and meditation as they can best accomplish. This is the easiest and safest way.

It is best and most fortunate for such souls if they are brought up as Catholics, for within this fold an innumerable company of saints, learned people, and plain men and women have found guidance and spiritual strength upon their way to God. It is true that spiritual inspiration and nurture can also be found in other bodies, but the Catholic system is the best example of the value and power of Institutional Religion. Its liturgies, ceremonies, and discipline are framed so that simple and semi-educated people can learn and worship, but they are so framed that they are also stepping-stones to higher forms of prayer and a more interior and spiritual vision of God. Its dogmas are not full descriptions or expressions of the truth, they are rather formulas for mysteries which no language can adequately express—formulas for truths that can only be rightly and fully understood by a mind trained in spiritual insight and spiritual activities. Dogmas resemble the walls which guard truths liable to be attacked, and when anything is thus guarded its nature is often partly hidden. Dogmas are like a grammar book, which teaches the simple rudiments of a language to guide the first steps of the student, who is expected to go forward to discover the full beauty of the language for himself.

The Church is primarily a Mother and a School. Age in the soul does not correspond to age in the organism. Innocent children of fourteen and fifteen are often older in prayer and older in spiritual knowledge than many coarse and careless persons of sixty and seventy, and many people never get out of the age of childhood in spiritual things. The Catholic Church teaches souls who are children in spiritual things to pray, and makes them able if they will to pass on to a more vital and direct knowledge of God. This is the power of the Catholic Church, and not its priestcraft, or its authority, or its picturesque ceremonies, or its “united front.”

To know each other, and help each other, and belong to each other, is the breath of life to spiritual souls, and the essence of Institutional Religion is the power of its corporate life. Its beliefs receive their strength from the authority and tradition of the body. Its liturgies and corporate ceremonies foster the spirit of conscious worship, and all its many organizations for the teaching and instruction of the young provide the means by which the wise can teach the ignorant, and the weak are helped by the strong.

But there is something more than this in the Church's corporate life. Not only does membership in a body provide conscious encouragement and teaching for individuals, but through the sacraments there is made available for the individual soul that spiritual power that was brought into the body of humanity with the Incarnation of Christ, a deposit of power which resides in and works through the body of the Church as a whole.

Sacraments apart from the body of the Church are impossible and unmeaning. Baptism is the form of incorporation into the Body: High Mass is a corporate act of worship setting into motion a volume of spiritual power quite unequalled by the adoration, however fervent, of a single individual. Nevertheless this truth does not submit itself to proof; it can only be recognized by those already familiar with spiritual things. I only mention it here in order to emphasize the fact that besides the conscious encouragement and teaching which membership in a body can bring, Institutional Religion carries with it a substantial power beyond and above the value of conscious faith in each individual member, and for this reason, although he may sit lightly to his Church observances, no devout soul of any kind, be he visionary, hermit, or philosopher, can afford to separate himself entirely from the Church body to which he belongs.

WAY OF EXPERIENCE.—If the essence of Institutional Religion lies in corporate life, the essence of mystical religion lies in the hidden inner life, the individual experience that each soul must find for itself. Mysticism is the communion and intercourse that takes place between the soul and God. Mysticism is the direct apprehension, by the intuitional faculty of the mind, of that spiritual power that lies behind and beyond and within the material phenomena of nature apprehended by the senses. Mysticism is a direct perception, a more intense realization, of those truths concerning God and the soul, and the soul's growth, and salvation, of which the verbal forms and authoritative statements and picturesque ceremonies of the Church are symbols.

In the spiritual life obedience comes first, then experience. In Institutional Religion faith partakes of the nature of obedience. In spiritual experience faith assumes the nature of vision. Spiritual experience should normally grow out of the practice of Institutional Religion. Indeed, it cannot be too strongly emphasized that experience is the final *raison d'être* of institutions, and if in any soul it happens that, as the years go on, constant attendance at services and obedience to rules of devotion produce no "change of heart," no growth in sensible love or concrete sacrifice for God, that soul has become dry and

barren. It means that the authority and forms of the Church have never been rightly used, or have become an end in themselves—a fetish or an idol. This, of course, does often occur, but it is not the fault of the institutional system, it is the hardness of heart of the people who have used it.

But this need not happen. All true Christians, who have a lively faith in God and order their common daily lives as best they can according to His Will, should seek and rightly expect to find, and learn to recognize, some experience of the guidance and working of the Holy Spirit in their lives—and this is mystical experience. All true Christians, whether Catholic or Presbyterian, High Church or Low Church, if they persevere in prayer, are capable of some communion with a personal God—and this is mystical experience.

II.—THE SOURCE OF MYSTICAL EXPERIENCE

MYSTICAL EXPERIENCE AND PRAYER.—Spiritual experience is born of prayer, and grows out of prayer, and happens in prayer, and is the flower and fruit of prayer. The practice of prayer begins with verbal forms and simple acts of devotion, and no one supposes—except the most ignorant—that it is possible to learn the great art of prayer and reach its higher stages without beginning upon such verbal forms. But also no one supposes—except the most ignorant—that there prayer ends.

The prayer that begins in obedience, as a daily practice, if rightly used, goes on growing till the habit of mental concentration upon a desire is formed. This practice of concentration goes on growing till one day—driven, perhaps, under the stress of some intense need—the person praying becomes aware that he has struck within him a stream of mental power which seems to have union with a greater will than his own, and he can turn this stream of power on to others as well as himself to carry out the good will of God. And this is mystical experience.

But the prayer of petition is not the true end of prayer. By perseverance, extending perhaps over a period of several years, and after many times of discouragement and many setbacks, the soul learns in meditation to withdraw itself from the consciousness of outer things, and finds an inner hidden sanctuary of quiet. There, as at Emmaus, on that other Sabbath, “Jesus Himself draws near,” and makes Himself known to His friends. And this is mystical experience.

PRAYER AND A CONSECRATED LIFE.—But when speaking of prayer as a great art, which certainly it truly is, it should be clearly understood that it is not an art which can be learnt and

practised, like playing the violin, as an elegant accomplishment, while the artist in his "off hours" may amuse and occupy himself as he likes. Prayer and a consecrated life go together. Mystical experience and spiritual power are the reward of the whole personality entirely dedicated and surrendered to God. This fact cannot be over-emphasized. One of the outstanding features of "the way" of mystical experience is that there are no half-measures. Spiritual privileges are very exclusive. If a soul would set out to see and possess God (and this according to their own account is the aim of the true mystic) he must be prepared to give up all other desires. He must learn by a process of training to detach himself in his heart—but not necessarily to separate himself in his outer life—from all other earthly possessions, and be content with God only. This does not mean that he may not marry nor have any human friendships—the divine love deepens human relationships—but the divine love must come first. Sooner or later, probably by no express action of his own, but rather by the trend of events, it will happen to such a soul that, in some form or in many forms, he will be called upon to give up and sacrifice to God all his cherished earthly possessions, all his deep-seated earthly desires. God, in His more intimate and most precious manifestation of Himself to the soul, will not be shared by any other love.

SUFFERING.—This stern lesson of detachment and the long and bitter education in humility which every soul who sets out on the path of holiness must undergo, accounts largely for that mark of suffering which almost invariably stamps the lives of the saints, and in a lesser degree brings an element of opposition and distress of some kind into the lives of all souls born with a strong genius for mystical experience. The subject calls for a larger exposition than is here possible. One can only briefly sum up the matter by saying that God enters into and takes possession of a man by taking possession of his heart. In order to possess God it is necessary to be possessed with the desire and longing for God, and, in order to attain this, the soul must be stripped of the taste and relish for earthly pleasures. Again, in order to be filled with the power of God, it is necessary—if this power is to be used in safety—to be purified from self-estimation and self-confidence, otherwise the power when it comes will only be used for self-aggrandisement. This gradual change in the personality cannot be accomplished without the discipline of pain, poverty, humiliation, and loss. This change in the fundamental desires of the personality is the key to the outward events of the mystic's life.

OUTWARD EXPERIENCE.—For him there is no real distinction between inward and outward experience. Both are controlled

by God, and both are brought about to some extent by the character of the man who receives them. His outward circumstances as well as his manner of reacting towards them mould his soul. He discovers that he is not only formed by, but also to some extent himself forms, those circumstances. But however far this is or is not the case, the surrender to God, which every interior soul is called upon to make, brings a unity and cohesion into the welter of changing, varying happenings which befall him. The soul that has felt the call of God surrenders his whole outward, as well as his whole inward, life to the ordering and guidance of the Holy Spirit. This surrender does not mean a helpless, nerveless, "lying down" under things as they are. Such a man must struggle for his material existence like other common men. Common sense and rational judgment are not suppressed or neglected, but rather strengthened and educated. Nevertheless such a soul does accept the buffetings of fate and circumstance as being controlled by a divine power for some good end, and he looks for the divine guidance and the divine assistance as he wades through them. Moreover, it is largely these buffetings and oppositions, coming against him in his outward life, that go far to draw out his spiritual powers and mould and discipline his interior soul.

III.—THE NATURE OF MYSTICAL EXPERIENCE

THE WORKING OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.—"The wind bloweth where it listeth, ye hear the sound thereof but cannot tell whence it cometh or whither it goeth." Never were words spoken more charged with reverence and true insight, and we shall do well to be guided by them in all our thoughts and utterances concerning the working of the Holy Spirit in the mind of man. The meaning of the saying is, "You can see its effects, but it itself will not be localized; you cannot lay your finger on its entry or its exit, its origin or ultimate direction."

This mystery of God's presence and working in the human mind is the subject-matter of mystical experience, and of this mystery the analogy of organic life is the best explanation. The spirit of man is to the living organism what life is to inorganic matter, and the appearance of the soul is as great and vast a departure in the scheme of creation, as new, as distinct, as mysterious in origin, as is the emergence of living from non-living matter. It is more than an analogy, it is a carrying further, a direct continuation in principle, of the same scheme. The spirit of man is a greater and higher organic unity than the living organism, as the living body is a more complex and elaborate scheme of working unity than the atom. But the

higher contains the lower within itself, and expresses itself through it as its vehicle and tool.

Man's mind in substance belongs to the sphere of the physical organism; it is of the same stuff as the minds of the animals, call it material if you like. His nervous system, and mechanism of memory and sense-perception, is identical with that of a well-bred horse or highly intelligent dog. But the fact that the Spirit of God dwells in him, the fact that his consciousness is open to, united to, and able to apprehend the universal, raises fresh powers in his consciousness, forms in him a fresh mental existence, and lifts him into the sphere of those spiritual processes which are peculiar to mankind, and belong only to his human existence. Thus is he made conscious of self, and conscious of what is outside the perception of the physical senses, beyond the "here and now," and *ipso facto*—a man. Nevertheless the substance in which the Spirit works, and the terms in which these unique thought-processes are expressed, is the material substance and mechanism of the animal mind.

In other words, the distinction between a man's mind and that of an animal is, that he is able to form "general ideas"; he is conscious of himself, and finds himself belonging to a bigger "whole." More and more as he becomes aware of and considerate of the whole to which he belongs, more and more as he leaves his own narrow world of selfish desire and immediate selfish outlook, so more and more he develops into a moral man. This is, "to love God and to love his neighbour as himself"—the sum total of morality.

I will insert here a quotation from a great master whom some of my readers will recognize.

"The fact of the fellowship of God and Man with each other, involves a fellowship of Spirit with Spirit. It involves the most important questions. It is a fellowship, and this very circumstance involves the difficulty of at once maintaining the fact of difference, and of defining it in such a way, as to preserve the fact of fellowship. That Man knows God implies, in accordance with the essential idea of communion or fellowship, that there is a community of knowledge; that is to say, Man knows God only in so far as God Himself knows Himself in Man. This knowledge is God's self-consciousness, but it is at the same time a knowledge of God on the part of Man, and the knowledge of God by Man is a knowledge of Man by God. The Spirit of Man whereby he knows God is simply the Spirit of God Himself."

Mystical experience is only the final fully-developed stage of this union with the universal, which in essence constitutes the creation of the human soul. It is an intensification, a quickening into a personal relationship with that Spirit whose presence,

unconsciously within him, is "the light that lighteth every man that cometh into the world." This union with the Universal Spirit makes him first human, then moral, then personally and consciously religious. Mystical experience is not so much a new gift in kind, but an increase in degree, a strengthening of the spiritual bond, a kindling, a blowing upon, that divine spark that is already there in every human being. As soon as it gets thus intensified—that is, as soon as the religious consciousness awakens and develops in a man—the Holy Spirit reveals himself as a Person, and deals with the soul personally. It is this heightened consciousness which brings about those experiences of spiritual reality and personal relationship to God which are the special characteristics of the mystical consciousness and the spiritual life.

(To be concluded.)

THEOPHOBIA

IN the history of Victorian thought there are few stranger chapters than the triumph of Darwinism. By Darwinism I do not mean that older doctrine of evolution which was sown by St. Augustine, watered by Buffon, reaped by Lamarck, and exploited by Darwin in his attempt to account for evolution by Natural Selection.

The older evolutionists were teleological. They attached great importance to design and purpose, and to the persistent effort on the part of the individual to exploit his environment to the best advantage. The giraffe's neck lengthened slowly throughout the ages because the giraffe was always stretching his neck to reach the higher foliage.

There is no place for design in Darwinism. The giraffe does not acquire his longer neck by trying. What happens is that the giraffes, who were endowed by blind chance with long necks, tended to survive because in times of drought they could reach foliage inaccessible to their shorter-necked contemporaries. This slight advantageous variation is inherited by their descendants, among whom, once again, the longer necks tend to survive. Long necks are, therefore, not the result and the reward of trying, but the result of luck, of blind chance, selecting those variations which enabled their fortunate possessors to survive.

"Natural Selection," as Darwin used the term, does not, of course, mean merely that animals with thicker coats will tend to survive an unusually rigorous winter, or that the giraffes with the longest necks have a better chance of survival. That is

mere common sense. Darwin believed the Natural Selection explained the transformation of species—*i.e.*, accounted for the evolution of a reptile into a bird, or an ape-like animal into a man. That is a very different proposition.

The *Genesis of Species*, by that distinguished biologist Mivart, appeared very shortly after the *Origin of Species*. The logic of Mivart's criticisms appears unanswerable today, but at the time Mivart and his book attracted little attention, perhaps because Mivart was a Catholic and, therefore, as Professor Hartog has recently remarked, his opinions were considered as negligible, as he evidently held a brief for a party standing outside the scientific world.

The exaggerated devotion with which science worshipped at the shrine of Darwinism was largely due to the fact that Darwinism was a valuable weapon against orthodoxy.

Natural Selection is, of course, not inconsistent with theism, for the Creator might, had he so chosen, have worked through the agency of pure chance undisturbed by design. But Natural Selection, though consistent with theism, deprives the theist of one of his most valuable weapons, the argument from design. Darwinism would not have survived as long as it did, had it not been for the pathetic loyalty of the Victorian materialist to a creed which provided him with a plausible alternative in the belief in design with its horrid consequence, the belief in God.

"We must assume," wrote Weismann, "natural selection to be the principle of the explanation of the metamorphoses, because all other apparent principles of explanation fail us, and it is inconceivable that there should be another capable of explaining the adaptation of organisms *without assuming the help of a principle of design.*"

The italics, which are Weismann's, emphasize the horror with which Weismann contemplated this distressing alternative.

"We must assume." The last of our Victorian illusions, the legend which contrasts the theologian who assumes, with the scientist who proves, must be abandoned. "Believing where we cannot prove" is Weismann's motto. It seems almost cruel to criticize this happy faith.

Another example, this time from Delage, the Professor of Comparative Zoology at the University of Paris.

Professor Delage found himself reluctantly compelled to reject Darwin's theory of Natural Selection, but he hastens to add:

"Whatever may befall this theory in the future, whether it is to be superseded by some other theory or not, Darwin's everlasting title to glory will be that he explained the seemingly marvellous adaptation of living things by the mere action of natural factors, without looking to a divine intervention, without resorting to any finalist or metaphysical hypothesis."

In other words, Darwin had arrived, by a theory which Delage rejects, at a conclusion which nobody can prove. If an "everlasting title to glory" can be established as easily as this there is hope for us all.

"Sit down before fact like a little child," wrote Huxley. This was admirable advice, and if Huxley and his school had followed it and sat down before the fact of religious experience, their conclusions would certainly have been modified. Instead of which Huxley and his disciples, as soon as they had left science for philosophy, began by assuming, instead of proving, their first premise, thus departing from the admirable precedent set by St. Thomas Aquinas.

"Huxley thought that if it were given to him 'to look beyond the abyss of geologically recorded time'—which, parenthetically it may be added, it certainly was not—he might 'expect to be a witness of the evolution of living protoplasm from not-living matter.' Yes, but why? He admitted that in the controversy between biogenesisists and abiogenesisists the former were 'victorious all along the line,' yet he held that spontaneous generation was 'a necessary corollary from Darwin's views if legitimately carried out'; and consequently, as he could not claim or hope to claim that spontaneous generation takes place today, he set it back to a period of which we have and can have no sort of knowledge. This is hardly a good example of the science which does not speak until it knows. Herbert Spencer's observation on the subject is well worthy of quotation, if only to show what nebulous theories can be put before the public in the outraged name of science. He says: 'At a remote period in the past, when the temperature of the surface was much higher than at present, the other physical conditions were unlike those we know; inorganic matter, through successive complications, gave origin to organic matter.' There are apparently people so constituted as to be hollow enough to swallow such remarks as this without seeing that in the nebulous phrase, 'through successive complications,' lies the whole begging of the question."*

Spontaneous generation is, of course, *de fide* for the atheists, but whereas Aquinas did not begin by assuming but by proving the existence of God, the more artless of atheists based this philosophy, not on reason, but on faith. "Spontaneous generation," wrote Weismann, "in spite of all vain efforts to demonstrate it, remains for me a logical necessity."

One can easily imagine the fine-hearted scorn with which Huxley would have overwhelmed a Victorian bishop who had been ingenuous enough to confess his belief that if it were given to him to "look beyond the abyss of historic time," he would certainly expect to be a witness of the evolution of Eve from Adam's rib, and who added "the literal accuracy of Genesis, in spite of all vain efforts to demonstrate it, remains for me a logical necessity."

* This quotation is from an excellent little book, *Facts and Theories*, by the late Sir Bertram C. A. Windle, F.R.S., a great scientist.

How can we explain this reluctance to accept any evidence in favour of theism? I am for the moment concerned not to criticize those who reject theism, but to diagnose the mentality of those who reject theism with relief. It is not the disbelief, but the will to disbelieve, which puzzles me. It is the malady of theophobia, to borrow Father Wasmann's useful term, which I am anxious to analyze.

Huxley and his school did not sit down patiently before the fact, and reluctantly arrived at their materialistic conclusion. Their belief in a mechanistic universe was not based only on an error in their logic, but was, in the main, a definite act of volition: the will to disbelieve in the theistic, the will to believe in the atheistic, hypothesis.

This will to disbelieve is essentially irrational, for it is irrational to reject with relief a philosophy which gives significance to the cosmic process and to welcome with joy the mechanistic interpretation of life which reduces the universe to an aimless interplay of atoms, an unending movement unredeemed from futility by the least suggestion of final purposes.

Sceptics may be divided into those who admit that scepticism and pessimism are synonymous, and the less courageous majority who refuse to face the logical consequences of their unbelief. The cynical hedonism of Omar Khayyám is consistent: the despair which finds expression in Thompson's *City of Dreadful Night* is consistent. Cynical resignation or despair is the logical consequence of a belief in a mechanistic universe. The more lucid of modern sceptics certainly waste no time in attempting to discover a substitute for the consolation of religion. "The only possible scientific ethic," writes Guenther, "is resignation." "Only on the firm foundation of unyielding despair," writes Bertrand Russell, "can the soul's habitation be safely built."

Such honesty is rare, and it is perhaps not surprising that most sceptics prefer to confuse the issue with fine talk about progress, humanity, and evolution. Science does not recognize the possibility of permanent progress, and indeed the cosmic process, if their theories are correct, may be compared to the perpetual winding up and unwinding of a ball of string.

The man who is a prophet by temperament and a sceptic by accident instinctively avoids preaching from a text which would deprive him of his congregation. "Dearly beloved brethren, I have nothing better to offer than unyielding despair as a foundation for your soul's habitation," may satisfy Mr. Russell, but it is far from satisfying Mr. Wells or Mr. Bernard Shaw. They are acute enough to realize that their readers will find it difficult to resign themselves cheerfully to extinction unless they can be persuaded that they are of superior clay to those who still cling

to immortality. It is, therefore, important to represent those who believe in immortality as irrational and those who desire immortality as ignoble. "Contemplate the starry heavens," explains the modern sceptic in the best pulpit manner, "and cultivate a sense of proportion. Why are you so interested in the survival of your own petty personality? Try and abandon this egoistic preoccupation with personal identity."

This would be more impressive if these preachers of cosmic humility resembled St. Francis of Assisi in their private lives, but as the result of much research I have come to the tentative conclusion that those who depreciate human personality in general attach as much importance to their private personalities as those who believe in the immortality of the soul. Of course, all this fine talk about the starry heavens and the relative unimportance of human individuality is very great nonsense and very great humbug. In his heart of hearts no man genuinely believes in sentiments such as these.

Why should it be regarded as normal to wish to be alive fifty years hence, and egoistic to dislike the possibility of being extinguished fifty-one years hence?

If an eminent physician assured Mr. Wells that he would continue for fifty years in full possession of his faculties, with all that this implies, I doubt if he would reply: "My dear Professor, my interest in my puny personality is so slight that I am indifferent whether I live for fifty days or fifty years. You see, I have just been looking at the Milky Way."

And if Mr. Wells would welcome the prospect of playing an active part in the great adventure of life in, say, 1979, why should he reject as ignoble the prospect of walking on in a drama staged elsewhere in 2959?

It is just because Mr. Wells has not thought out the full implications of his creed that his writing loses its grip whenever he touches on this theme.

Aquinas knew what he believed and knew exactly what he wanted, and his writing was, therefore, as definite and as clear-cut as Euclid's. Not so Mr. Wells, who escapes from the conclusions deducible from his premises in a cloud of meaningless metaphor.

"The life to which I belong uses me, and will pass on beyond me, and I am content."

What does this mean? There is the life of his body which belongs to Mr. Wells. There is the life of the community to which Mr. Wells belongs, but what exactly is the life to which Mr. Wells belongs? It seems rather silly to personify life, and to refuse personality to the "Lord and Giver of life."

This confusion of thought is, of course, due to a failure of nerve. Mr. Wells has not the courage to face the bleak and

scientific universe of the scientist, a universe in which there is no single permanent achievement of the least value.

"The cosmic process goes on inexorably. There are no ends towards which the external changes are working. . . . On a small body in a corner of the universe certain beings were produced for a moment, to go rigid for ever with their planet in the next. Such is the story of mankind . . . the only possible scientific ethic is resignation."

Or rather such would be the story of mankind if we reject the atheistic explanation.

And this brings us back again to the problem of theophobia, for it is indeed puzzling to explain the eagerness with which men afflicted by this malady rejected the one hypothesis which will give significance to the human Saga.

I admit, of course, that there is nothing particularly surprising in the fact that the Love of God is almost as exceptional as the love of the integral calculus. "The love of God is," as Tyrrell remarks, "the luxury of a few happy and imaginative temperaments. In the lump man was not created for the love of God, but for the love of man. Had God really wanted us to love Him as we love our human friends, He would have given us eyes to see right into heaven."

Catholicism in this respect has been less exacting than Protestantism. Protestantism has always tended to over-emphasize emotion and to make a purely emotional state (for which various formulæ, such as justification by faith, have been invented from time to time) the test of salvation. Justification by faith was, in effect, an appeal from behaviour to emotion, from works to faith. Now behaviour can be, but emotion cannot be, controlled. The Catholic Church, has, therefore, been wise to insist that her children should strive to obey God's laws, but that they should not be distressed because they do not possess the power of loving God, which God reserves for his saints. God, in other words, demands obedience, but does not necessarily demand love. To most people the love of God is, indeed, an implicit, not an explicit passion.

"I have seen Him lay His beauty on the morning hills." Thus Wordsworth, and there are many for whom, as for Wordsworth, the love of God is implicit in the love of His works.

But the comparative rarity of theophilism does not explain or account for the existence of theophobia. We can best approach that problem by analyzing the various types of theophobia.

First there is the theophobia which is a reaction from Puritan upbringing.

"If you can realize," writes Mr. Shaw, himself a product or

reaction from Protestant Irish Puritanism, "how insufferably the world was oppressed by the notion that everything that happened was an arbitrary personal act of an arbitrary personal God of dangerous, jealous, and cruel personal character, so that even the relief of the pains of maternity, by means of chloroform was objected to as interference with his arrangements which he would probably resent, you will understand how the world jumped at Darwin."

Perhaps, but the jump was influenced by emotional reactions rather than by logic. Mr. Shaw's major premise seems to be "The Victorian God of Protestantism was a most unpleasant deity"; his minor premise "such a God is inconceivable," and his conclusion "therefore does God not exist." It would be as logical to deduce that the Alps do not exist because medieval man did not like mountains and believed that they were haunted by the most terrifying of dragons. The dragons have disappeared; the Alps remain. The Victorian God of Puritanism has, we hope, disappeared, but God remains.

Socialistic theophobia, like Puritan theophobia, is based not on reason but on emotion.

The Church has often been allied with the possessing classes, but it does not follow that the bench of Bishops or the college of Cardinals correctly interpret the politics of the Creator.

In Russia theophobia is a symptom of Communism.

"The term *Bog*, God," writes Bukharin, "comes from the same root as the word *Bogaty*, rich. God is therefore strong, powerful, and rich. What other names has God? He is called the Lord; that signifies Lord in contrast to slave; God is also called the ruler of Heaven, and all the other titles of God, such as Governor and the like, point in the same direction. . . . Faith in God is thus a reflection of loathsome earthly conditions; it is faith in a slavery which exists, presumably, not only on earth but through the universe."

This is all very well, but "Bog," at least, might be given credit for guaranteeing the continued survival of Bukharin. "Bog," in other words, unlike Bukharin, may perhaps be a necessary evil.

Scientific theophobia is partly due, as Professor Eddington has pointed out, to a "tidiness of mind which rebels against the idea of permeating scientific research with religious implication." It is the duty of the scientist not to fall back upon the First Cause as an explanation, but to do his best to discover the secondary causes. To invoke a supernatural solution is often a mere excuse for idleness and ignorance.

None the less scientists should be the first to welcome a theistic philosophy, for the *raison d'être* of science disappears in the philosophy of materialism. If the earth is nothing more

than a by-product of matter, if, to quote Huxley, "the whole world, living and not living, is the result of the mutual interaction, according to definite laws, of the forces possessed by the molecules of which the primitive nebulosity of the universe consisted,"* there is no scientific justification for the first article in the scientist's faith, the belief that the pursuit of truth for the sake of truth is supremely worth while. According to the mechanistic hypothesis truth and falsehood are the immutable results of the workings of the irreversible law, and we are left without any criterion which will enable us to express any preference for those movements of matter which register truth rather than falsehood in our brains.

"If, for example, we admit that every thought in the mind is represented in the brain by a characteristic configuration of atoms, then if natural law determines the way in which the configurations of atoms succeed one another it will simultaneously determine the way in which thoughts succeed one another in the mind. Now the thought of '7 times 9' in a boy's mind is not seldom succeeded by the thought of '65.' What has gone wrong? In the intervening moments of cogitation everything has proceeded by natural laws which are unbreakable. Nevertheless we insist that something has gone wrong. However closely we may associate thought with the physical machinery of the brain, the connection is dropped as irrelevant as soon as we consider the fundamental property of thought, that it may be correct or incorrect. The machinery cannot be anything but correct. We say that the brain which produces '7 times 9 are 63' is better than the brain which produces '7 times 9 are 65,' but it is not as a servant of natural law that it is better. Our approval of the first brain has no connection with natural law; it is determined by the type of thought which it produces, and that involves recognizing a domain of the other type of law—laws which ought to be kept, but may be broken."

Theophobia, again, is often due to that most human of failings, snobbery. Theism was as unfashionable in Victorian scientific circles as it is unfashionable in the Georgian intelligentsia.

Huxley and Grant Allen would have sympathized with the matter, though they might have deprecated the manner, of a certain famous confession (1909) from the pen of Mr. Arnold Bennett.

"In my opinion it is absolutely impossible for a young man with a first-class intellectual apparatus to accept any form of dogma, and I am therefore forced to the conclusion that Mr. Chesterton has not got a first-class intellectual apparatus. (With an older man whose central ideas were definitely formed at an earlier epoch, the case might be different.) I will go further and say that it is impossible, in one's private thoughts, to think of the acceptor of dogma as an intellectual equal."

It is consoling to reflect that first-class work has been done by men who do not possess what Mr. Bennett calls a first-class

* Belfast address, 1874.

intellectual apparatus, and what the rest of us call a first-class intellect. Pasteur, for instance, did good work, and yet Mr. Bennett would have found it impossible in his private thoughts to think of Pasteur as an intellectual equal, for Pasteur cheerfully admitted that he believed as much as a Breton fisherman, and shamelessly added that if he was a better scientist no doubt he would believe as much as a Breton fisherman's wife.

Theophobia, again, is often due to a reaction against the moral code of Christianity. Its rigidity was disliked and Christian theology was accordingly attacked. It is, of course, a polite convention to credit the Victorian atheist with a severe austerity of private life. I cannot speak for the Victorians, but nobody would be rash enough to assert that all Georgian sceptics are notorious for their exaggerated respect for the moral code of Christianity. The complete breakdown of sex-restraints in Russia is only the logical consequence of the mechanistic philosophy.

Theophobia is not common in the world of art, though the artist is apt to think—with some justification—that Christianity has over-emphasized one aspect of God, His righteousness, and overlooked the fact that God is the God of beauty no less than of holiness. The artist with a Puritan background may react against religion, but he seldom fails to realize, consciously or subconsciously, that though Puritanism may be hostile, materialism is fatal to beauty.

Natural law, as we have seen, fails to discriminate between the brain of an Einstein and the brain of an idiot. Beauty, no less than truth, is an irrelevancy in the materialistic universe. There is no criterion to distinguish between the movements of atoms which produce a Bellini masterpiece and a cigarette card. There is no hierarchy of values in the materialistic philosophy. The genius does not take precedence of the idiot, the masterpiece of the daub.

In the modernist art movement the reaction against realism in art is, in effect, a return to realism in philosophy. The coloured photograph type of painting corresponds to nominalism, for it is inspired by the conviction that there is no reality behind appearances. The modern emphasis on significant form is an attempt to pierce behind appearances to reality. Mr. Clive Bell would, of course, resent with horror this interpretation of his views; for he lacks the mental training of medieval theologians. He does not define his terms or realize that the phrase "significant form" asks a question. Significant of what?

It is precisely because materialism is not significant that the artists must be ranged if not with the theophilists, at least not with the theophobists.

Materialism weakens not only the religious but also the æsthetic sense. Consider, for instance, the reactions of a consistent materialist to a great cathedral such as St. Mark's of Venice. He may be endowed with a natural appreciation of beauty, but even so his æsthetic sense must be blunted by his creed; his enjoyment will be confused and troubled. He might, perhaps, discover a consistent and rational basis for preferring a sixteenth-century mosaic, to make room for which so many of the older Byzantine mosaics have been sacrificed. The Venetians of the Renaissance were intrigued by the newly-discovered laws of aerial perspective, and in their delight at a mechanical solution to what are in effect scientific problems they lost their sense of significant form. But he would certainly miss all the fun of those delightfully artless mosaics in the Atrium describing with such gusto the story of Noah and the patriarchs. Unless there has been some period in your life when Noah was almost as real a person to you as your own father, there must be an unbridgable gulf between your mind and the mind of those Byzantine craftsmen. Noah and Adam will be as unreal to you as the gods and goddesses of Greece. But the appeal of St. Mark's is not purely æsthetic. The materialist would miss much that the Breton fisherman's wife would discover. To a materialist a cathedral is a monument to human folly, the tomb of human hopes, the building in which foolish medicine-men have performed their foolish rites. One need not be a Catholic, one need not even be a Christian, one need only be a half-believer to feel that there is something more in St. Mark's than the stones of which it is built, for the past is still potent and not so dead as the materialists would have us believe.

"Thou hast left behind
Powers that will work for Thee; air, earth, and skies. . . .
Thou hast great allies;
Thy friends are exultations, agonies,
And love, and man's unconquerable mind."

Whether the hopes and fears and joys of past generations can permeate these great shrines I do not know, but there are moments when I half believe in their persistence, and even half-beliefs are better than none. I agree with Goethe that these half-beliefs are the poetry of life—*die Aberglaube ist die Poesie des Lebens*. Men who have been nurtured in the arid atmosphere of rationalism suffer from stunted imaginations. Think, for instance, of John Stuart Mill. There is something lacking in his mental equipment. "There was no twilight in the soul."

That is my chief complaint against materialism; not that it is immoral, but that it is dull and ugly. One cannot, of course, cherish picturesque beliefs just because they are picturesque.

I should like to believe in fauns and dryads, but they have vanished for ever from my world. I am mainly concerned to point out that there is a real distinction between those who regretfully and those who joyously abandon beliefs which give significance and beauty to the common round.

"From haunted hill and dale
Fringed with poplar pale
The parting genius is with sighing sent."

"With sighing"—that is the point. I do not criticize those who get rid of God with a sigh, but I cannot understand the rationalism which finds cause for rejoicing in the twilight of the gods.

ARNOLD LUNN.

THE BOOK OF AMOS*

It is a pleasure to read Mr. Cripps's Monograph on the Prophet Amos and his work. The Bibliography (p. 105 f.) shows how rarely Amos has been treated, except as one of the "Minor Prophets," and yet he well deserves a place to himself. Mr. Cripps's book is on a generous scale, though it is quite readable even for those who know little or no Hebrew: there are 110 pages of Introduction, the Text (R.V.) and Commentary take up 168 pages, followed by more than 40 pages of longer Notes, and four extended "Excursuses."

As Mr. Cripps very well remarks (p. 322, end of note), "Amos, man and prophet, is a discovery of the nineteenth century A.D." Not only was the generally held theory of the nature of inspired Scripture unfavourable to ways of looking at books of the Bible which laid stress on the several authors' personality, in Amos's case the matter had been prejudiced by St Jerome, who understood vii. 14 to mean that Amos came from the uncultured classes, and that consequently his eloquence as well as his "inspiration" were alike miraculous. But Amos's words do not imply this: he was not a "professional," whether prophet or agitator, but if he was a *nōkēd* (i. 1, probably also vii. 14, as Cripps agrees), so also was Mesha, King of Moab, who dealt in sheep by the hundred thousand (2 Kings iii. 4). If we are to assign Amos to a class, it will rather be to the class of old-fashioned country gentlemen who look on Courts and the New Rich with suspicion and dislike.

Some of the difficulties, literary and critical, in the Book of Amos depend very largely on the view we take of the com-

* *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Amos*, by R. S. Cripps, B.D., with a Foreword by Canon R. H. Kennett, London, S.P.C.K. 1929.

position of the Book itself. There is not much controversy about the date, though Mr. Cripps makes out a very attractive case for dating the appearance of Amos about 742 B.C. rather than some fifteen years earlier (p. 35 ff.), that is to say, at the very end of the reign of Jeroboam II. In any case 741 is the latest possible date. In dealing with so ancient a writing, a writing, moreover, which must be regarded as pioneer work, both from the point of view of ideas and of literary form, it is obvious that we ought to scrutinize very closely the method of transmission, as far as it is possible to do so. The question may be put more bluntly thus: Did Amos write down his sermons and his visions? And if so, under what circumstances?

From one point of view we may divide the Bible Prophets into two classes, occasional and professional. These are not the good and the bad, the "true" and the "false." Examples of "true" professional Prophets are Elijah and Elisha, Ezekiel and Jeremiah: their whole life, or at least the most important part of it, was occupied with their prophetic calling. On the other hand, Nahum is only occupied with the fall of Nineveh, Joel with a single visitation of locusts. The "prophecies" of Zephaniah and Malachi can hardly be described as a life's work. All these may fairly be described as occasional Prophets, and to this class Amos belongs. When Amaziah the priest of Bethel took Amos for a professional, Amos emphatically disclaimed even the title of prophet: "I am no prophet nor one of the 'Sons of the Prophets'; the LORD took me from my regular work and told me to come here" (vii. 14, 15).

What does this imply? I think, if we are attempting a sort of biography of Amos, we may venture to expand. Amos seems to me to know too much about Samaria and Bethel for his denunciations to be entirely hearsay or the result of indignation aroused by a single short visit. Doubtless he had visited these places, and many more in Israel, many times in the course of his life, and his style shows him as a keen observer. Probably he may have brought his own clip of wool to the markets of Northern Israel from time to time: there is no reason, whatever his social position, to think of him as never having travelled from Tekoa before his prophetic journey. I am inclined to accept Amos vii. 15 quite literally—that is to say, that Amos had travelled and seen and pondered, and that finally, when at home, he felt a special and definite impulse to go to Bethel, doubtless at some annual festival, and deliver his message. That message is given in Amos i. 2 to vii. 9. What follows in vii. 10-17 (the story of Amos and Amaziah) is not, as Mr. Cripps calls it (p. 227), "an historical incident," but the tale of the immediate result of Amos's *one* public appearance. Amos

i. 2 to vii. 9 is not, like the later chapters of Hosea or the oracles of Isaiah of Jerusalem, a record of a long prophetic activity: it is a single discourse, diatribe, sermon, all pitched on the same note. There are some minor incoherences, no doubt, and one or two verses are supposed by many critics to have been insertions by some later editor. But the discourse as a whole hangs together: it seems difficult not to conclude that it is *the* discourse that provoked Amaziah's interference.

Well, then, Amos was an "occasional" prophet; i. 2 to vii. 9 represents the denunciatory discourse he made when he went from Tekoa to Bethel in order to make it; vii. 10-17 tells us what happened when he had delivered his message. It does not appear that Amos was martyred: but he had said his say, and we may regard chapters viii. and ix. as further visions and oracles that came to him later, after he had returned to his home in Judæa.

Does this view of Amos throw any light on the literary problems of the Book? I venture to think that it does, particularly upon the problems raised by the epilogue (ix. 5-10, 11-15). This epilogue seems to promise blessings, unlike the great discourse, and in general to have a rather different outlook from the rest of the Book. Mr. Cripps (Introd., xii., pp. 67-77) is inclined to deny Amos's authorship of the epilogue. He quotes a striking paragraph from Cornill:

"What is won by the acceptance (of the prophecies of salvation)? and at what price? Won is an earlier date for a few prophetic passages than the critical school is willing to concede, but the price paid is that we have to break the backbone of the prophets, to reduce them to weaklings who had not the courage to think their thoughts through to the end and draw from them the necessary consequences, but who, when their own people are in question, blunt the edge of their threats and 'let milk and honey flow from the cup of wrath of Yahweh'" (p. 71).

This is finely said, and might very well be used by any one who should suggest that "but make not a full end" was an interpolation in Jeremiah v. 10. But whether this line of argument be appropriate for the last paragraph of "Amos" depends upon the view we take of the literary composition of the whole book. If it be regarded as part of his message to Bethel it is clearly inappropriate. Whatever his creed or his "eschatology," words of consolation are inappropriate to the utterance contained in Amos i. 2 to vii. 9. But if the *Book* of Amos be regarded not as a manifesto to Northern Israel—Amos's *spoken* word was that—but rather as a record of what Amos remembered having said, then the matter seems to me different. I look upon the Book of Amos somewhat in the light of Isaiah viii. 16 f. ("Bind up the testimony—I will wait upon the LORD").

We are told to regard the Book of Amos as something new, the first of the series of *written* Prophecies. But throughout it has all the marks of spoken Hebrew (Cripps, p. 65): the greater part of it is rather the record of a speech than a treatise or a pamphlet. To Amos, no doubt, the delivery of his message was *the* thing; writing down what he remembered having said at Bethel was an afterthought. He added at the end some further visions, and, seeing that the composition of a book, unlike the delivery of a speech, *must* be a work of reflexion and deliberation, he added an epilogue. It is not a question of a conventional "scheme of eschatology" or of "woe and weal," but of the fundamental optimism of the true Jew: "All will end well, I can't tell how, but our God can do it!" It is not really an anticlimax, rather, it is an expression of faith, notwithstanding Amos's special, and in his day paradoxical, doctrine that the LORD will punish wrongdoing, even if Israel be the wrongdoer.

Why do I bother about this epilogue? It is somewhat conventional in form and spirit: it is not for the epilogue that we regard Amos as a landmark in the development of ethical thought. No, but neither are Cornill's fine words, quoted above, a scientific argument: they are a plea that Amos would be more like a thoroughgoing modern pessimist, if the epilogue be regarded as somebody else's. The scientific literary critic is only concerned with the historical question, whether the evidence suggests that Amos did actually add the paragraph. What sort of an "editor" or "redactor" added it? When the decrepit tabernacle of David is raised up, "they will inherit the remnant of Edom" (ix. 12)—that comes first, and then—"all the nations over whom My Name has been called"—i.e., all the tribes and territories over which David once ruled in the LORD's Name. When was this the apocalyptic hope of Jews? After the Exile the outlook is œcumenical, and even before the Exile Zephaniah is announcing a solemn assize for all nations upon earth.* The modesty of expectation which is found in Amos ix. 11 ff. is surely something very early, something which is earlier than the Reform under Josiah, earlier than the glimpses of universalism which we find in Isaiah. What it is most like is the expectations of the country Judæan Micah, who hoped for a new David to arise from Bethlehem and drive away the Assyrians. It is, in a word, not a "Messianic prophecy," but rather a sort of missing link, which in due time would develop into Messianic doctrine: "howbeit that is not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural, and afterward that which is spiritual."

I cannot but feel that those scholars who regard Amos i. 2

* Zeph. iii. 8.

("The LORD shall roar from Sion") as an editorial addition—Mr. Cripps is one (p. 115)—are unconsciously influenced by feeling that the imagery is too conventional for so ethical a teacher as Amos. But it makes a splendid and suitable opening. Moreover, a conventional beginning was specially appropriate. It is followed by the "oracles" against the neighbouring peoples ("For three transgressions of Damascus and for four," etc.), and these also are, to a great extent, conventional. No doubt Amos takes some pains to pick out appropriate crimes to have incurred the wrath of the LORD who loves mercy and justice, but the Prophet is not really interested in their fate; he is only leading up to Israel, to the great paradox of iii. 2 ("You only have I known").*

The chief point of all these remarks really concerns what may be called rhetoric. Mr. Cripps and some of the distinguished scholars, English and foreign, that he quotes, do not seem to me to allow enough weight to general rhetorical effect. They ask with somewhat over-anxious care, what is the exact logical connection between sentence and sentence, and if it seems faulty they resort to theories of "interpolation," of "editors," or of "fragments of a separate discourse" (Cripps, p. 153). But what is quite certain is that, whatever the occasional logical obscurity may be, the rhetorical effect is uniformly and most impressively kept up from i. 2 to vii. 9. Let anyone read this section rapidly through in Hebrew or English and then try the same thing with Hosea iv. to xiv., and he will be at once conscious of the difference. The one reads like a discourse, the other like detached notes, mere heads of many discourses. Of course, if one thinks of Amos's sayings as notes taken down by some hearer and then somehow preserved it is natural to break up the collection into detached paragraphs. But if so, what a genius the collector was! How marvellously he has fused the utterances together!

I venture to think that Amos, having gone to Bethel under a sense of Divine mission, having delivered his message and having then returned to his home in Judæa, then set down (or caused by dictation to be set down) what he remembered having said, and further, that this theory explains the general uniformity of tone and the comparatively high degree of coherence to be found in his "prophecy." The Book of Hosea is notes of a life's work; the Book of Amos is an orator's reminiscences of his own speech. Not that Amos is always logically consistent: as Mr. Cripps says, it is "spoken Hebrew." If there are only participles in iv. 13

* With regard to ii. 4, 5 (the Oracle against Judah), it may be remarked that it does not much matter whether the passage is Amos's own or added by a later editor for completeness; in any case, it is in itself conventional, but quite appropriate in the context *rhetorically* as leading up to ii. 6 ff. (against Israel).

and v. 8-9, the best answer is that there are only finite verbs in v. 10, though the whole of that verse is really a sort of apostrophe. But who cares, except a grammarian?

Perhaps the length of these remarks, whether they be agreed to or not, may make some of my readers turn again to the Book of Amos. If they do so, and take Mr. Cripps's book as a guide, they will find it a most instructive one. I take this opportunity of adding a few detached remarks.

(1) The two doxological passages iv. 13 and v. 8-9 are thought by many scholars, and Mr. Cripps among them, to be interpolations. The chief reason appears to be that, grandiose as they are, they seem to have no direct logical connection with the context. I should like to suggest that they are not a "description of the Deity" (p. 184, note), but a solemn *naming* of God, and that in itself to the Hebrew was of the nature of an oath. In plain prose the passages mean "I call God Almighty Himself to witness that I mean what I say."*

As for the "Pleiades" and "Orion" I wish Mr. Cripps had read an old article of mine in the *Expositor* for April, 1900, in which I point out (p. 310) that *Kīmā* and *Ksīl*, the two constellations mentioned in Amos v. 8 and Job xxxviii. 31, were supposed to be connected with the rainfall: "When the Holy One wished to bring the Flood upon the world, He took two stars out of *Kīmā* and the Deluge came through" (*Berach. 58 b, B. Mez. 106 b*). This whole passage not only names the LORD, but describes Him particularly as the God of the thunderstorm. I should like further to suggest that "turneth the shadow of death into the morning" is not the meaning, but that it must mean the same as the parallel half-verse—viz., "maketh the day dark with night": translate therefore "turneth back the thick darkness into the morning." It is all part of the black thunderstorm in which (as in iv. 13) the LORD rides over the hilltops.

(2) In Amos iii. 9 I do not think the "mountains of Samaria" are "the famous heights of Ebal and Gerizim" (Cripps, p. 159). If one stands to-day on the top of the hill on which Samaria was built it seems to be encompassed with a ring of mountains.† They are far away, but it looks as if spectators could see all that was being done in the city. It is to these mountains, as to a gigantic stadium, that Amos invites the nations to come and see.

(3) The word translated "palaces" (*'armōn*, i. 4, etc.) is discussed in the *Quarterly Statement* (Pal. Expl. Fund) for July, 1927, p. 154. The writer there suggests "bazar." I would

* See Mark xiv. 61; Rom. i. 25, ix. 5; 2 Cor. xi. 31; and *J.T.S.*, v., 454 f.

† I found when I was there that another member of the party thought as I did—"it reminds me of Copernicus in the Moon."

rather suggest "block of buildings" (Latin *insula*): this fits everything required, for the self-contained block may be at once the defensible stronghold and "palace" of a noble and a bazaar with shops. Of course in the East the shops do not communicate with the interior of a block.

(4) It is quite possible to translate Amos vii. 2 (see Cripps, pp. 98 and 220, note 3), if we remember that Semitic style sometimes leaves out a too obvious apodosis altogether, as in Dan. iii. 15, Luke xiii. 9. Translate then thus, the obvious apodosis being supplied in italics: "¹The LORD shewed me, and He was forming locusts at the latter growth: ²and it will come to pass if they have completely eaten the grass of the land *we shall be ruined*. So I said 'Forgive us, how shall Jacob stand?'" The word supplied in the English of Dan. iii. 15 and Luke xiii. 9 is "*well*"; here the word wanted is "*ill*" or "what a misfortune!" or anything similar. By supplying some such phrase we get the right tenses for "it will come to pass," and "so I said," and a natural meaning for "if."

(5) I cannot conclude without quoting Mr. Cripps's dictum at the end of his excellent Note on the meaning of the phrase "Thus saith Jehovah" (Introd., pp. 78-83). He says: "What was to Amos's first hearers paradox, is to his present-day readers axiom. They of whose message this is true made no rash claim, when they used the words 'Thus saith the LORD.'"

F. C. BURKITT.

CONTEMPORARY RELIGION IN GERMANY

RELIGIOUS conditions in present-day Germany present to the onlooker an extraordinarily large number of anomalies. With, for example, the admitted fact that the Protestant Churches have experienced a great falling off in attendance-membership, the "Calendar of the German Universities" gives for the winter semester of 1928-29 something over 4,000 theological students, to which the estimate for the present year would add 500 more. Yet a city church seating 2,000 people may have a Sunday morning congregation of less than a score; a country parish, which before the war was distinguished for the practically complete church loyalty of its population, is now as completely turned against the church. A business friend of the writer, who has been a resident in Germany for more than a decade, volunteered the comment that in all of his business and social relations with Germans he had yet to meet with one single person genuinely and whole-heartedly devoted to the Church. On the other

hand, the activities of church book-shops, of the Domestic Missions Society, and of a number of distinguished leaders, suggest as well the vitality of religious convictions as the response to such efforts. In attempting to order the writer's impressions, it has seemed best, having touched upon certain of the chief characteristics of the German religious temperament, to consider the historical antecedents of the present religious situation and the complex of other factors which affect religion. The final section will attempt to interpret the movements in Protestant and Catholic religious life.

I

There are at least four conspicuous qualities of the German religious temperament: its individualism and subjectivism, its mystical quality, the deep metaphysical interest which distinguishes practically all German religious writing, and, finally, what for lack of a better term might be called its nationalism. Most of these characteristics are as true for the Protestant as the Catholic outlook. The quintessence of individualism and subjectivism is most strikingly illustrated in the characteristic tenets of the founder of Lutheranism. The vigour and vitality of the root principle of Lutheranism is as fully manifested today as it was in the days of the seventeenth-century Pietists. The religious relationship has been conceived ever since the Reformation as subsisting chiefly between the individual soul and God. The historic emphasis on "the Sacrament of the Word," with its vast variety of meanings, rests ultimately upon this assumption. It is no less difficult for a non-Lutheran to understand Luther's teaching on this point than it is to gain a clear conception as to the shades of meaning of this phrase today: what is sometimes called personal religion, Bible study, meditation, participation in the sacraments of the Lutheran Church, can all be included under this one term. Even in Roman Catholicism since the Reformation the dominant Teutonic trend has been toward a piety which is largely individual and subjective.

Closely connected with the subjective individualism of German piety is its strong mystical fervour. One of the recent religious revivals among Roman Catholic students is based upon a new appreciation of the German mystics—Susso, Tauler, Meister Eckhardt, as well as the more modern mystics. Protestant piety is undoubtedly thoroughly mystical in quality. One's impressions of the worship of a modern congregation, the slow swing of the chorale, the mystical content of the words, and the dignified deliberateness of every act of the service, point to the conclusion that its structure and quality are both designed for the mystical edification of the individual worshipper. The

reading of the Scriptures, and the sermon, also serve this same end. In much the same way, the traditional types of Catholic worship in Germany show similar characteristics; German worship is essentially different in ethos from that of Belgium and France.

Every new religious movement in Germany first digs deep metaphysical foundations. The instinct towards philosophic speculation is peculiarly congenial to the German mind. Of the two conspicuous movements in German religion today—the Barthian, which is exercising a great influence on Protestantism, and the Liturgical Movement within Roman Catholicism—there is no doubt as to the fundamental and central importance of the metaphysical interest. In the main, the metaphysical outlook in religious matters is idealistic, for the individualistic temperament finds this particularly attractive. As a practically inevitable by-product, there is an outstanding quality which might be described as non-pragmatism. From its premises to its conclusions German metaphysics may be rigidly logical, but it is seldom concerned with practical consequences. One has accustomed himself to look always for the deep groundings in philosophy of any new view, programme, or movement.

German nationalism in its aspect as *Kultur* is an exceedingly complex phenomenon. One has only to pick up the writings of a German theologian to realize how thoroughly impregnated they are with what, for lack of a better term, must be called German nationalism. In many respects the movements of religion and the affirmations of the German *Kultur* would seem to be at variance: that regimentation of life (for even a Communist parade will march in goose-step) which characterizes so much of the external world, seems to have little relationship with the strongly individual movements in theological and devotional thought; passionate patriotism would seem hardly consonant with mystical piety and devotion to a universal God. There is no doubt that the war served to intensify love of the Fatherland, and religious movements in Germany have all a certain strongly patriotic tinge.

All of these characteristic qualities possess their own weaknesses: subjective and individualistic piety can degenerate into sentimentalism or go off into self-pity; mystical religion can become grotesque and bizarre, metaphysical speculation wordy and fruitless; the national spirit may sharpen itself to a shrill and strident Jingoism, as well in matters political as religious. In the main, however, the interaction between these forces has been fruitful and constructive—witness the dependence of all religious scholarship, no less since the war than before it, upon the best that the German genius has produced.

II

The *Evangelische Kirche* had just about a full century of life under the conditions which Friedrich Wilhelm III. had planned in 1817. German people who were dissatisfied with the State-created Church, partly Lutheran and partly Reformed, could either organize themselves into new religious societies or emigrate. For the full strength of the historic Lutheranism of the seventeenth century one must look to the conservative Lutherans in America. In fact, the past century, while it has released the energies of critical and scientific scholarship in Germany, has witnessed a widening breach between the development of German religious thought and that of American Lutheranism. The force of Lutheran scholasticism, pietism, and even rationalism, has largely spent itself in Germany, to survive across the Atlantic. But these three phases form the background of the modern outlook of German religion: Luther's thought and Calvin's *Institutes* continue to be reinterpreted; Rudolph Otto's *Das Heilige* has a strong kinship with the best of seventeenth-century pietism; the ravages of modern radical criticism have historical counterparts in the destruction wrought by the *Aufklärung*.

German Roman Catholicism has produced during the past century its distinguished list of theologians and scholars. Many of them were men of independent judgment; all of them maintained a high tradition of thoroughness and industry. German Catholicism is largely animated by a pre-Tridentine spirit, which is showing interesting manifestations today. Especially since the war has the Catholic theological world made great strides, for it has not confined itself chiefly to the type of historical studies which were its greatest claim on the attention of scholarship during the generation preceding 1914, but has branched off into a number of fields where its yield has won no less admiration.

The disruptive effects of the war and its aftermath were poignantly felt by the *Evangelische Kirche*. One of the results is the organization of some twenty-eight *Landeskirchen*, the exact relationship of which to the several States has never been specifically delimited. The absence of any formulation of the precise status of this Church to the Prussian State was glaringly manifested by the reaction of Protestant opinion, not uncharged with strong emotions, on the now consummated Prussian Concordat with the Vatican. From the economic point of view, the Church lost much of its income due to the results of the deflation; depreciation of investments, the falling off of contributions, and the demoralization of policy, have crippled and

paralyzed its work. Above all, the years of disillusionment dealt the Church a heavy blow. To all intents and purposes the Kaiser had been the Pope of Protestantism; the clergy had been active as recruiting sergeants and as prophets of a certain and God-given victory. The discrediting of the Church in the eyes of the common man, the relaxation of discipline, and the economic and social unrest combined to produce a mood, widespread and clamorous, which was actively hostile.

Protestant piety in Germany is not necessarily bound up with churchgoing. The falling off in attendance at church since the war had its antecedents in this outlook on religion. When the writer questioned one of the leaders in the *Evangelische Kirche*, he was told that certain important facts must not be left out of the picture: the thorough and prolonged religious training of the child, culminating in Confirmation with its own more intensive preparation; the strong individualism and independence of the German, and the fact that since the years of disillusionment there has been a strong tide setting in toward that type of loyalty which is evinced by the voluntary payment of the *Kirchensteuer*. Many members of the Church view the present tendency with concern, but without undue alarm or dismay. To an outsider, however, the symptoms seem to be distinctly disquieting. The tradition, of course, on the Continent, is entirely different from that either in England or America. One must weigh quite carefully the consideration given above, in order to have some sense of perspective on the German situation.

German Roman Catholicism has suffered very little as a consequence of the outcome of the war. There has been undoubtedly a gain in population due to the colonization by Roman Catholics of certain hitherto untouched tracts of territory. The post-war period has brought about an immense propaganda on the side of Bolshevism, conducted not only as a political and social programme, but for all intents and purposes as a religion. Contrary to the hopes of some of the Roman Catholic leaders, the *Centrum* has allied itself as a political entity not with the forces of Christian interest, but with the strange political bed-fellow of Socialism. When there is so much of rampant atheism and ardent materialism, it would seem wiser to join forces with the party which, at the least, defends Christian theism, instead of which the political alliance by which was achieved the Concordat of the Prussian State with the Vatican was formed with the forces of secularism, to the neglect of a possible understanding with German political parties professing Christian principles. Nowhere more than in this respect has political Roman Catholicism shown its strength and its weak-

ness. The hostility which has been aroused is the price paid for a political success of distinctly dubious value to the Roman Church.

III

What has been suggested above indicates some of the chief lines of divergence between organized religion on the Continent and the forms with which we are more familiar in the West. Vastly more than the factors usual to us enter into the complex situation represented by the place of religion in the present history of Germany. There is, first and foremost, the presence of militant Bolshevism. When the writer was talking a few weeks ago to a yeoman farmer about conditions in Northern Germany, the point to which he returned again and again was: "I fear the East." The whole of that complex and innovatory order of life which is represented by Russia has made inroads among the disaffected population of Germany with what is in effect a new gospel—the religion of Bolshevism. If it be true that the British Empire contains far more than the actual territory under the English flag, it is equally true that the domain of Germanic *Kultur* extends far beyond the compass of the Republic. Into all the vast sweep of lands and peoples where German is spoken or read has gone what to many appears to be the subversive and seductive propaganda of a materialistic atheism. Its presence in Germany has elicited the need for organized opposition and a political propaganda. The religious forces of Germany, Protestant as well as Catholic, have alike entered Parliament and exist there as distinctively religious political entities.

Atheistic materialism has borrowed many of the methods that have hitherto characterized Christianity. It is not only as representing a hostile and rival religion, but also as embodying an ethic utterly alien to all that Christianity espouses, that it has provoked the opposition and challenged the forces of organized Christianity. Bolshevist Sunday Schools, Young People's Camps, and community service units, have aroused the fear of those who uphold the standards of traditional Christianity. Every device that has been utilized by those anxious to instil the Christian way of life has become part of the machinery of propagandist atheism. The logical combination of forces in Germany for the defence of Christian ideals would seem to be that of Protestant Christianity with Roman Catholicism. But the century-long hostility between Protestant and Catholic, exacerbated by the fear on the part of Protestants of papal domination in Teutonic countries (for even one-third of Holland is politically Roman Catholic), has militated effectively against

such a joining of forces. There is great fear among the Protestants lest the political propaganda of Rome operate actively by way of fishing in the troubled waters of German unrest. Such gains as Roman Catholicism might make would be set down to the political astuteness of its leaders, lacking which the Protestants, as a whole, have had no concerted programme. There is as yet no effective cohesion between the Protestant groups, who ascribe to Roman Catholicism a political astuteness and a far-seeing programme which its own leaders deny that it possesses. Whatever gains Roman Catholicism may make purely as a religious corporation, from the successful negotiation of political *coups*, remain highly dubious. It is in other fields that we must look for the rejuvenation of German Catholicism.

Political, nationalistic, social, and economic factors are so intimately interwoven that the religious situation can hardly be analyzed apart from this complex of forces. Twentieth-century church history in Germany is not unlike the age of the Reformation in this regard. In the examination of Protestant and counter-Reformation activities the same dilemma presents itself to the student: Which are causes and which are factors?

IV

Both the Protestant and the Catholic religious worlds have had to take cognizance of the Youth Movement, or *Jugendbewegung*. In large part it is a movement of revolt. Certain sections of it have declared their independence of the tradition of Christianity. Even in the more radical sections, experiment with the new and untried has largely proved the innate conservatism of those who would seek to keep the old values in a new setting. Certain aspects of the Movement, however, have shown that disillusionment with organized Christianity—particularly in its Protestant forms—has not meant the discarding either of the teaching of Jesus or the authority of His Person. Quite apart from any association with the forms of organized Christianity, the writer has been assured by those who know the trends of youth today that there is a vivid and vital interest in things of the spirit. The Catholic Youth Movement has shown some very interesting developments—in one particular form a three-fold aim: the recovery and reconstitution of the old German dress and customs as over against the drab uniformity of modern civilization; the quickening of interest in, and development of devotion in accordance with, the mystical life of the German Catholic tradition; and vigorous advocacy and zeal for the principles and practice of the Liturgical Movement.

In Protestant theological circles there have always been, of

course, the conservative and the more liberal schools. The conclusions of theological scholars have, however, been reached by the employment of the same method. One would almost have said that the historico-critical method was universal. Roman Catholic scholars, conservative and liberal Protestant theologians, and entirely detached students of theological matters, all employed the same method. At present, however, the Protestant theological world is aligned largely into the two camps of the Barthians and the "Barthloser." The Barthian theology cuts across much which had been assumed to constitute the only legitimate method in scientific theology; there is a complete absence of any strong interest in Biblical criticism or the historical method; little dependence is placed upon the verdict of history; above all, his theology runs counter to the normal implications of traditional German religion, for it calls away from all subjectivism to a vivid affirmation of the divine transcendence. Barth has been accused of having merely revived a Calvinistic metaphysic as a substitute for a theology. From the works generally known it would be difficult to have a fair picture of his system. The publication of his *Dogmatik* will, however, enable the student to obtain a much more adequate picture of the theological system of its author. His supporters have developed an ardent partisanship, and friends and foes alike speak of him with intense feeling. As a corrective to the subjectivism of much German piety, the teaching of Karl Barth will exercise a wholesome influence: the iterated affirmation of the there-ness and transcendence of God, the insignificance of man apart from correspondence with His will, and the fresh study, not from the intellectualist, but the religious point of view, of Holy Scripture, all come as unique contributions to the present religious thought of Germany. Some of his ardent disciples, such as Brunner and Gogarten, have carried certain aspects of his teaching into new applications.

On the whole, one forms the impression that much of the normal teaching of theological subjects is sheerly intellectualist. Some of the younger professors are, however, bringing into their lectures a new vitality and religious zeal, but the traditional objectivity of the theological disciplines entails an aridity which has little appeal to the head and less to the heart. In going about from university to university, one of the striking phenomena that meets the observer is a new combination of popularity with scholarship. Such lectures as those of Lietzmann in Berlin, and Pfeilschifter in Munich, leave little to be desired in the way of adequacy of treatment of the subject matter and its skilful presentation—in the best sense, popular. Several hundred theological students vigorously show their

approval by applause; a well-made point meets with instant appreciation, and the subsequent student discussions suggest how thoroughly interested and absorbed are the auditors.

The instinct for worship, in a sense known to the Catholic tradition, has largely vanished from the practice of Protestantism. Many people feel that there is a crying necessity for its revival. This is particularly true of the leaders of the High Church Movement, who are a small minority without a great following. The principles on which Catholic worship is based—its corporate and social character, its objectivity, and the utilization of material things to express rather than impress—are so uncongenial to traditional Protestantism as to be practically counter to its assumptions. It is in the Liturgical Movement within Roman Catholicism that we may see the full flowering of the age-long Catholic instinct in a new form. Post-Tridentine piety, largely influenced by Ignatian ideals, has shown conclusively the reaction of Protestantism within the Roman Church: in practice, both worship and the devotional life have become intensely personal and individual. The truths of the worshipping community and the corporate character of the Mass have been obscured by the practical detachment of each individual, save for "intention" alone, from the drama at the altar, performed *before* and *for* him, but not *by* him. The Liturgical Movement aims to bring back the old Catholic ideal, and to bind up every worshipper through the service with the action of the Mass and the thought of the Offices. To this end there has been a double aim on the part of the leaders of the Movement: addressed to the thinking and scholarly world, a series of solid and scientific essays have attempted to lay sound theological foundations; similarly, a popular series of handbooks and manuals—largely a practical working out of the theories expounded in the larger works—make specific application of the principles for the use of the worshipper in church. Where the Movement has had freedom to develop its own technique, congregational worship has practically become vernacular. What the priest and the server say in Latin at the altar is said aloud in German by a *Vorbeter* and the congregation from the pews. There are handbooks for use at the Offices as well as at the Mass. Excellent translations have appeared which aim to do more than supply a vernacular version. Points for meditation within the sequence and cycle of the liturgical year, and the extension of the method into the so-called "Liturgical Retreat," have given a new quality to the whole devotional atmosphere of German Roman Catholicism.

The headquarters of the Liturgical Movement in Germany is the Abbey of Maria-Laach in the Rhineland. A visit there is a

revelation as to the possibilities of the devout and intelligent performance of worship. The eleventh-century abbey, the superb choir of Benedictine monks, the atmosphere of unhurried energy and quiet activity, and the traditional hospitality, stimulate and move the visitor profoundly. It is not only the vast intellectual resources of the abbey (from which emanates the *Jahrbuch für Liturgiewissenschaft*, and a host of books, pamphlets, and articles), but the richness and variety of personality, from the Lord Abbot and the Father Prior down to the humblest lay-brother, which warm and stir the guest's heart. These Benedictine Fathers give much to the world about them, which they understand and help actively from the vantage-point of their own vocation. While the Liturgical Movement is not peculiar to Germany (since it is in full swing in many places in Belgium, Holland, and France), in its German form it is fairly sharply marked off from the contemporary types elsewhere. The deep theological foundations, the continuous efforts of research and investigation, the high level expected on the part of the layman, and the warm devotional zeal, distinguish it from a purely archæological or ritualistic revival.

The chief battle of German religion today, Protestant as well as Catholic, has to do with the very foundations of Christian theism and elementary Christian ethics. The tragedy of the situation is that religious forces cannot combine to meet the subversive and direct attacks of the new religion from Leningrad. It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that in many parts of the German-speaking world the one organized force which can cope effectively with the disruptive and challenging propaganda from Russia is Roman Catholicism. The bases of Protestant unity which maintained before the war have long since been destroyed, and German Protestantism has not by its history been prepared to meet this new emergency with unified power.

When we turn to theological education, it seems apparent that there is a sufficient supply of candidates for both ministries, Protestant as well as Catholic. Complaints have been made that the intellectual preparation of the theological students leaves something to be desired. When the universities had to admit for matriculation not only the graduates of the *Gymnasium* but also those coming up from the *Real-Schulen*, the theological curriculum has had necessarily to undergo modifications. There is, however, little evidence of any departure from the traditional structure of the theological disciplines. Undoubtedly there are numbers of theological students to whom the ministry offers chiefly a respectable position and an assured income. The post-war poverty of many clerical families has shut off one of the avenues of supply of theological students,

the sons of the clergy. Among Roman Catholics there seemed to be current the impression that the supply of candidates from the country districts had not kept pace with that from the cities. While it may be unjustified to draw any sweeping deductions from the fact, there has been an increase in vocations to the religious Orders, particularly in the South. The method employed by both Protestant and Catholic Churches, the use of the State universities (for all but four newer foundations have theological faculties), has much to recommend it. Intellectual leadership in these troublous days must be gained at the place where intellectual life, controversy, and varying currents of opinion and conviction, flourish. It remains to be seen whether or not this contact with the universities will maintain as a means of immediate knowledge of the problems and difficulties of the modern world. Surely no more sensitive instrument could be designed than that which the broad interests of university thought create for the interpretation and solutions of the problems of the present.

The course of events in Germany should be followed with the utmost sympathy by Anglican Churchmen. In a sense as true today as it was early in the century, the *Sturm und Drang* in Germany will either create or emphasize parallels in the world of English thought. Above all, it is vitally necessary to keep in mind the important place which men trained in German theology occupy in the projects for the reunion of Christendom. This world is as large as the circle of those who read German works, and embraces not only the Germanic peoples properly so called—Holland, the Scandinavian countries, and the German-speaking Czechs, Russians, and the like—but also an increasingly large number of people beside. Never before has there been so keen an interest on the part of this great group in the problems with which the *World Conference on Faith and Order* and the *Life and Work Movement* deal. A sympathetic understanding and an active appreciation of all that is transpiring in Germany today will not only enlarge the Anglican's horizon, but also enable him to speak and interpret, with persuasive authority, the convictions which are his heritage.

F. GAVIN.

MISCELLANEA

NOTES AND COMMENTS

WE have received a copy of *A Simple Catechism on the Catholicity and Continuity of the Church of England* (S.P.C.K., 1d.), which has been compiled by the Archdeacon of Chichester. We know of nothing which deals so admirably with the subject in the short compass of thirty pages; and we heartily commend it to our readers. They will find here solid Catholic teaching as to the character and history of the English Church; clear and convincing rejection of the Papal claims; a well-balanced treatment of the Reformation; and the whole illustrated by apt and telling quotations from authorities. At a time when English Churchmen are being besought to desert their heritage for Rome or to dissipate it in vagueness, the publication of this *Simple Catechism* is particularly timely.

Four "Theology Reprints" have now been published, viz., Dr. Vincent Taylor's *The First Draft of St. Luke's Gospel*; Dr. Lowther Clarke's *The Copyright of the New Prayer Book*, and *The Problem of Sunday Services*; and the Master of Corpus' *The Christian Sacrament*. Dom Bernard Clements' *Notes on Prayer*, printed in THEOLOGY last August, are now in course of preparation for this series, as also the present writer's articles on The Incarnation, which appeared in July and August.

We have received four of a series of penny pamphlets under the general title of *Major Issues of the Day*, issued by the Christian Social Council. The subjects are "International Peace," by Sir Willoughby Dickinson; "The Lot of the Miners," by Henry Brooke; "Unemployment," by Ruth Kenyon; and "Education," by Albert Mansbridge. The names of the authors are a guarantee of careful treatment of the various problems dealt with; and the pamphlets will be a welcome addition to bookstalls in church.

NOTE

THE JERUSALEM CONFERENCE (II.)

THE fifth volume of the report is concerned with the relations of Christianity to the industrialism which is everywhere invading and revolutionizing the life of primitive communities. Rev. W. Paton shows the different problems raised and the principles involved. In America, he notes improved conditions and increasing sensitiveness in the Churches, records some of their ideals and organizations for social study and service; he reviews the work of C.O.P.E.C., and the Stockholm Conference of 1925, and the establishment of an Institute of Social Research at Geneva. Turning to India, he finds 73 per cent. of the population engaged in agriculture, yet industrialism definitely established and growing rapidly and affecting village life in many ways. In cities housing is scandalous; conditions of work are regulated and improving; public opinion developing. Conditions in China have been very bad, and the revolutionary movement aims at reforming them, but often as yet without effect; the Churches are devoting much attention to the problem, and several of their recommendations are printed here. In Japan good advance has been made in practical

achievement, again aided by Christian influences. In other Eastern countries the problems vary, and the International Labour Office is studying these with a view to providing material for instituting reform. In Africa there is some improvement in industrial conditions, but the opportunity is not always taken of utilizing the past experiences of Asia; competition between black and white seriously complicates the issue. Forced labour is being restricted by the League of Nations, and is chiefly limited to public works: it brings grave dangers of disease and mortality—the appalling figure of 94 per cent. mortality is quoted from one undertaking; it lowers morale, interferes with domestic and tribal life, and it is at times obtained by indirect and unworthy means.

In general, industrialism has meant great suffering to primitive peoples and the break-up of their tribal life and sanctions; they are everywhere trying to protect themselves, and if the Church fails to take her part in helping, she will lose influence and violent methods be encouraged. The Church, both at home and abroad, must study the facts; she must preach the social aspect of the Gospel; she should encourage legislation, provide workers, promote education, and herself become a more real and effective fellowship.

In Latin America, dealt with by Dr. S. G. Inman, the social sense is awakening and as yet undeveloped; immigration is strong; the grip of foreign capital is severe, and this seriously handicaps the efforts of missionaries who are themselves foreigners. Mr. H. A. Grimshaw urges the forestalling of known evils in primitive areas; here the industrial movement causes a revolution greater than in nineteenth-century Europe, and unasked-for by the native. Some governments are attempting this, and policies of regulation and protection, insurance, housing, education, etc., should everywhere be promoted and money retained in the country for them out of the abnormally high profits made by foreign capital; richer areas should help poorer, and trade be conducted on co-operative lines; the Church can help much. Mr. R. H. Tawney claims that the issue is religious, ethical, and spiritual, and suggests principles of a Christian sociology; Bishop F. J. McConnell pleads for human values as against materialism, and the duty of creating Christian environments.

The Council's statement shows Christianity to be social as well as individual; demands that wealth shall be servant and not master; postulates three criteria (the sanctity of personality, brotherhood, corporate responsibility); the Church's failure to control industrial life has been, perhaps, the greatest hindrance to her work. It makes a number of suggestions relating to the investment of foreign capital, the economic development of primitive areas, protection against injustice, and the avoidance of international friction. It supports the League of Nations, and recommends a central bureau for the study of the world's social and economic problems in the light of Christianity, and for the co-ordination of information and workers.

The breadth of view and inspired statesmanship of the Conference is nowhere seen to better advantage than in the sixth volume, which deals with

THE CHRISTIAN MISSION IN RELATION TO RURAL PROBLEMS;

indeed, many of our home country clergy and workers in their difficult and exacting work would gain from its reading. Dr. K. L. Butterfield points out that two-thirds of the world's population are rural and from

75 to 85 per cent. of the mission field, and that rural life and work has its peculiar features, conditions, and relationships; the community sense is strong, and isolation from town and industrial life develops a different mentality; the country has been comparatively neglected by modern movements, and even exploited, but it is vital to national life and has invaluable facilities for character training and religious teaching; it is the counterpart to industry, and both are to be Christianized. He postulates (*cf.* the Industrial Report) the intrinsic worth of the individual, his right to the fullest opportunity of self-development, life as social as well as individual, the need of removing prejudices which cause division. There follow suggestions as to how these ideals may be realized through legislation, organization, and education; he urges the increase of trained rural missionaries and experts, concentration on communities and local groups, and the training of local leaders, large policies by missions and governments. Mr. W. J. McKee gives samples of work in rural areas, evangelistic methods, health campaigns, educational programmes, farm schools and colleges, training of leaders, community service and mass education, relief works in the Near East, co-operative credit. Dr. T. J. Jones outlines a programme of rural work based on the principles laid down by the two previous writers; it comprises an organized series of agencies, central, middle, and local, with a department for propaganda and extension work, supervision and friendly visitation, the choice of leaders, co-operation with governments. Dr. E. de S. Brunner contributes a sample study of rural work, and it takes the form of a most thorough and detailed analysis and description of Korea; he notes a depression in agriculture, suggests its causes and remedies, and its effect on Church life. There is an inspiring description of a model community, Torin-Ri; a discussion of social life and the work of the Church, which is now making less progress than formerly; a suggested programme for the future; and attention is called to the need of specialist missionaries and continued study of the problems of rural life. The same writer adds shorter studies of China and India, with a discussion of Church activities and suggested programmes; also of Asia in general, calling attention to the problems raised by industrial impacts, social and family conditions, illiteracy, the need of technical education, the antagonism to the West, over-population; he stresses as essential the method of co-operation by the Churches, practical demonstrations of Christian community life, agricultural missions with technical efficiency.

The Council's statement upholds the foregoing contentions, insisting that Christianity must be regarded as comprehensive of all life, and emphasizing the obligation on the Church to develop a Christian rural civilization; intensive methods and community development as the most effective agencies; education of young and old, individuals and masses; training of leaders; the value of country life for religion and the place it holds in the Bible; the preservation where possible of local characteristics.

No one could have been chosen better qualified to deal with

INTERNATIONAL MISSIONARY CO-OPERATION (VOL. VII.)

than Dr. J. R. Mott, and out of his wide experience and many travels he reminds us how much international co-operation exists already in secular affairs; this increases the need of world-wide missionary co-operation, and of more and better qualified leaders and thinkers to handle it. Churches

and nations must pool their knowledge and experience, and this will result in mutual stimulus and encouragement as well as in increased power; it will develop a larger and truer statesmanship, enrich the Christian message, foster a truer catholicity, release power, greatly commend the Gospel message, increase financial resources, make stronger appeal to people of big minds and wide activities, and to the young; many of the problems before us are world problems, and can therefore only be solved by collaboration; and only by and from unity with and in Jesus Christ will come power adequate for them. Dr. Mott shows how much the co-operative method has advanced since the Edinburgh Conference of 1910, and gives a number of instances and their results; these would have been greater had there been larger support from the home bases; the most noteworthy fruits are the International Missionary Council (the body which met in Conference at Jerusalem), and the World's Student Christian Federation. The regions in which co-operation is more urgently needed are those of literature, education, evangelism, the training of missionaries, relationships with governments, planning of policies and facing world-wide problems, such as those of race, immigration, industry, rural life, lay work, the impact of Western civilization, finance, theological thought, and the mutual life of the older and younger Churches. A most valuable passage based on actual experiences outlines the factors most required for successful co-operation, and a discussion follows of the work and future of the International Missionary Council itself; a meeting once in five years is as much as can be expected, but the periods will vary with the occurrence and importance of world-issues; a committee has been appointed to keep the work in being, and this will meet probably every other year.

The Council's statement calls attention to the growth of National Christian Councils from two in 1910 to at least twenty-six today; they are of various types accordingly as they originated at home or in the mission field, but all are ruled by the desire to regain the Unity of the Spirit; this has not led to any ignoring of differences or surrender of convictions, nor is federation the objective. The Council asserts the absolute necessity for co-operation, and shows how it has already proved its value, and records a number of principles which should govern all attempts to practise it. The Council's new constitution and a directory of co-operative councils and their secretaries is included, with appendices giving various resolutions passed at Edinburgh (1910), Oxford (1923), and Canterbury (1922), and the constitutions of various national missionary organizations and councils.

The last and eighth volume completes the series with accounts of other spheres and aspects of missionary work not already directly touched on and with sermons and addresses. The Rev. W. Paton in an historical outline traces from 1854 the practice of international co-operation and describes its growth, the formation of the International Missionary Council, and the work and procedure of the Jerusalem Conference; he notes four outstanding impressions, viz., unity, world-wide fellowship, recognition of social and national problems as of equal Christian concern as personal evangelism and conversion, the spirit of prayer; the last found fuller expression in the Call to Prayer issued to the Churches with its now familiar requests for a missionary spirit, the spirit of prayer, sacrifice, unity, interpretation of the Gospel, moral witness, service, and personal conversion. Two illuminating and first-hand accounts of the situation in China and India come from Dr. D. Z. T. Yui and Dr. S. K. Datta respect-

ively. Professor D. K. Heim reasserts the missionary obligation, and rejoices in the recall to first principles now demanded; the original motive was the awareness of God, not the sense of man's need which came later; God in Jesus Christ is our message; this involves repentance, change of heart and outlook; other religions have value, but none of them bridge the division between us and God. The Rev. Dr. J. A. Mackay illustrates from his experience in South America some necessary methods of evangelism; these are: win a right to be listened to even on secular grounds, separate and rid the message of all traditional ceremonial attachments, adapt the message carefully to the current situation and need; the need of South America (as of other countries) today is a sense of absolute moral values and a redemptive personality. Bishop Linton describes his methods in Persia; in addition to the usual methods, social service is growing and co-operation between the Churches which are also finding their own power of self-determination. The Rev. Dr. E. Stanley-Jones records anxieties about Christianity on intellectual grounds, about domination of one group by another, about the capacity of our spiritual resources, and he suggests correctives. A masterly treatment of the psychological issue comes from Professor W. E. Hocking; he describes the instincts of the human make-up, and the lack of unity in the individual man; discusses more particularly greed, sex, and pugnacity; indicates the need of a co-ordinating objective; finds it in the sharing of God's creative power; shows how Christianity meets the need by its sense of human worth, its absolute moral demand, its conservation of the instincts by reorientation. The approach to the Jew is handled shortly by the Rev. Dr. J. M. Black: personal contacts are everywhere possible and the most fruitful method. Medical work, says Dr. Frimodt-Möller, is an essential part of our Lord's work as inherited by the Church, and not merely an evangelistic aid; local Churches should carry their own hospitals where possible, but excellence is a prior consideration.

Dr. J. R. Mott's opening and concluding addresses are given stressing points already mentioned in these two articles, and adding the need to bring the memory, the imagination, the heart and the will to bear on the experiences of the Conference, all as in the presence of God. A sermon by the Bishop of Salisbury deals with our opportunity and work as God's fellow-workers in the creation of a new world; he adds that prayer is the next step to be taken; the Rev. Max Yergan shows the need of the Church's own conversion; the Rev. Dr. Cheng Ching-yi the conditions and the content of vision; and there is a great sermon on the Resurrection by Dr. R. E. Speer.

It is clear that there is much in these volumes which could and should be handed on to the home Churches, and the clergy and missionary leaders will find in them much material for sermons and addresses. One cumulative impression asserts itself: here were big issues both for the world and the Church, faced by big men in a big way, in the Spirit of Jesus Christ; here were idealism and statesmanship and devotion. How unutterably petty does most of our normal Church life and interest seem beside it! Are we, clergy and layfolk alike, equal to the lead given us? Was not the truest word spoken which said that it is the home parishes which need conversion as much as the heathen countries? Is not the Archbishops' Pastoral and its call to renewal most timely?

S. P. T. PRIDEAUX.

REVIEWS

THE CHRISTIAN TASK IN INDIA. By Various Writers. Edited by the Rev. John Mackenzie, M.A., Principal of Wilson College, Bombay. With an Introduction by the Most Reverend the Bishop of Calcutta. Macmillan. 7s. 6d.

By an earlier generation the Christian task in India would have been expressed in a single sentence as the preaching of the Gospel, but the moment we begin to attempt any detailed consideration of the matter it becomes apparent how wide a field is covered by that phrase. What is "the Gospel," and how is it to be preached? The present volume of essays is not concerned with the first of these two questions so much as with the second. In his Preface to the volume the Principal of Wilson College, Bombay, explains that "throughout the book the Christian position has been taken for granted," and as the bulk of the contributors to it are members of various Protestant Churches, it may be assumed that the "position" taken for granted is roughly that of current Protestantism. A comparison of the subjects of the fifteen essays comprised in this book with the sixteen in *Essays Catholic and Missionary* shows that while, as is to be expected, they cover a great deal of common ground there are certain topics which a Catholic will naturally emphasize, but which are omitted in the volume under review or merely touched upon in passing. After an essay on "The Nature of the Task," by Mr. S. K. Datta, comes a group of essays dealing with the intelligentsia, the people of the villages, and the women of India respectively. Father Winslow writes with sympathy and enthusiasm of the educated Indian, but surely his enthusiasm runs away with him when it expresses itself in such a statement as that "there is a very widespread acceptance (by educated Hindus) of the main principles of Christ's teaching, particularly of His ethical teaching." What of the Incarnation, and the Atonement, of sin and redemption, of the gift and work of the Holy Spirit? Are these not to be reckoned among main principles, and can it be said that they are "accepted" by educated Hindus? Again, there is emphatic commendation of the "rich and rare treasures in the spiritual heritage of India" but scarcely a hint that Hinduism in actual practice is a terrible power of evil which enslaves the souls of its adherents and is marked by a trail of uncleanness which seems inseparable from the practice of idolatry and the worship of gods and goddesses with whom are associated legends which inevitably deprave the mind of their devotees. The essay ends

with a beautiful passage urging the need of "a more worthy and attractive type of Christian living." The Bishop of Dornakal writes with intimate knowledge of the people of the villages, who, as he points out, form 93 per cent. of the population of India, and makes many interesting and admirable practical suggestions, though the omission of any reference to the need of a penitential system and the Church's ministry of absolution is a serious defect. In her essay on the women of India, Miss Van Doren is right in emphasizing the immense influence which the lives of Sita, Savitri, and the other heroines of ancient Indian story exercise over the womanhood of India today, and no one who knows can doubt that this influence is on the whole an influence for good; but it is strange that in writing on this topic no mention at all is made of the Blessed Mother of our Lord, the type and pattern of Christian womanhood; and it is to be regretted that "social uplift" should bulk so largely as the characteristic fruit of Christian faith and the chief concern of missionary effort. The next two essays deal with education, elementary and advanced. Both are admirable, and are the fruit of long experience. Miss Ethel Gordon of Poona draws attention to the fact "that far more, and generally far better, work is being done for Christian girls than boys." The reasons for this are not far to seek, but we cannot be content that it should be so. She enters "a serious caution," to which it may be hoped that all missionaries engaged in educational work will give heed. "No training school," she writes, "must be too large. Nothing in the way of organization and expert management can replace the value of the close and intimate touch which those who train teachers should have with their students. In the end, what counts in a teacher is a consecrated personality, and that tender growth needs the greatest nurture and care and the stimulus which contact with other personalities alone can bring." The Editor draws an interesting comparison between Dr. Duff and William Miller, two great men whose work has had a profound influence on educated Indians in North and South India respectively, and is more convinced than is the present writer of the value of missionary colleges. Dr. Macnicol writes with authority on Christian literature, and has, as it seems to us, a juster view of Hinduism than Father Winslow, and we welcome his criticism of Miss Mayo's absurd and entirely imaginary picture of the Calcutta student.

Dr. R. H. Goheen, writing on the ministry of healing, quotes a striking pronouncement of the Christian Medical Association of India, in which the conviction is expressed "that the ministry of healing is an essential part of the work of the Christian Church, whose mission it is to represent God as revealed in Jesus Christ."

Mr. Edwards, in his essay on "Public Questions," appears to build great hopes on the penetrating power of Christian ethical ideals apart from Christian faith, but surely Mr. Higginbottom, who writes on the problem of poverty, is right when he says that he is driven to reassert that "a thorough-going acceptance of Jesus Christ as Saviour and Lord, and just as thorough-going an application of His Gospel to all the affairs of life, will bring India to her rightful place among the nations, and solve her poverty problems. Her spiritual, moral, and social poverty is the cause of her economic and political poverty."

Mr. P. Oommen Philip tells of "indigenous Christian efforts," and especially of the National Missionary Society of India. "Co-operation" is dealt with by the Rev. W. Paton, writing out of the fulness of his knowledge, and he makes a notable confession of his faith that "even more than the co-operation of separated Christian bodies, India wants the unity of the Church of Christ." The chapter on "The Church of Christ in India," by Dr. Macnicol and Mr. Oommen, develops a theory and ideal which is not that of Catholic Christians, and in "An English Layman's Contribution," by Mr. J. A. Davies, we are presented with the criticisms of "dogma," churches and sacraments dear to the heart of journalists. The final chapter, "Towards Unity," is by Dr. Palmer, Bishop of Bombay, with appended notes by the Rev. J. H. Maclean of the United Free Church of Scotland, Conjeeveram, and the Rev. F. H. Russell of the United Church of Canada Mission, Central India. Dr. Palmer summarizes the proposals for reunion in South India, and explains their genesis. When he says of the Bishop that "he has a special responsibility, a special gift of God for fulfilling it, and a special authority," he would appear to be claiming for the episcopal office a good deal more than the Wesleyans, for instance, are prepared to grant.

The Christian task in India, as conceived by the contributors to this book, is one of great magnitude and difficulty. To St. Paul it presented itself as an urgent call to "preach Christ, and Him crucified." Is there not a danger of becoming too much occupied with the circumference to the neglect of what is central, of abating the exclusiveness of the claim of Christ in a generous desire to recognize the good in ethnic religions, and of getting rid of the "offence of the Cross" in order to recommend the Christian faith to the non-Christian world? It would almost seem as if we had grown afraid to say with St. John, "He that hath the Son hath the life; he that hath not the Son hath not the life."

T. E. T. SHORE.

THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH. By B. H. Streeter, D.D. Macmillan and Co. 8s. 6d.

Canon Streeter's methods are those of Mr. Maskelyne or Mr. Devant. There is the same disarming appearance of transparent integrity, the same disingenuous patter, the same incredible deftness of execution; and before we can draw breath he has produced an utterly unexpected rabbit out of an entirely prosaic hat—or, to adopt Canon Streeter's own language, has evolved a wholly contemptible White Rabbit out of an entirely estimable Apostolic Father. By wizardry of this kind some sixty years of crowded life have been tidied up so that the merest child can understand them. We had most of us, I suppose, grown accustomed to think of the sub-apostolic period as a welter of undigested ideas on every topic; a maelstrom so full of cross-currents that no writer of the time could be expected to be wholly consistent, and any was lucky who escaped being wholly unintelligible. We were content that the Didachist should not really have made up his mind as to the degree of inspiration with which he credited the "prophets"; or that the compiler of the Pastoral Epistles should have put together fragments of documents emanating from different schools of thought on order and discipline. It no longer worried us to suspect an evangelist of including in his Gospel traditional material which had ceased to have any real meaning for him, or which flatly contradicted his usual point of view. We know our own inconsistencies, self-contradictions, evasions, lapses, and changes of mind—and we pride ourselves on being educated; we expect, therefore, that these half-educated primitives will exhibit the same phenomena, though to a vastly greater degree. In this attitude towards the documents we have been confirmed by the *religionsgeschichtliche* school of theology. It has taught us never to look for more than tendencies, and to be prepared to find the most divergent or even contradictory opinions in the same writer—on the same page, in the same paragraph. Not till the third century or so do we feel that we are out of the chaos in which Christianity was born, and can sit down to study its history with some hope of reaching clear results.

Canon Streeter will have nothing of this. He has reverted to an earlier conception, though with a very marked difference. Two generations ago things were much clearer—before the "Didaché" was discovered, to be exact; and before as much was known of the parentage of gnosticism as is known to-day. Then theologians conceived of a uniform paganism opposed by a uniform Church, complete with a faith and order once delivered to the saints. From this uniform Church heretics and schismatics emerged occasionally, but the simplest test—the test, in

fact, of the tradition of faith and order—revealed the cloven hoof at once; there was no further difficulty except to get them extirpated and expelled. On such a basis history could be written. Canon Streeter is far from accepting this basis, and yet his own is not unlike it. He assumes as his fundamental principles that no document from primitive times could have survived unless it had the backing of some important Church; that no such backing would have been forthcoming unless the document was clear, consistent, and of more than momentary importance; and that no such document could be written unless it was written for a definite occasion with a definite purpose. And therefore—without considering how unlike a literary world guided by these principles would be to any literary world the world has ever known—he assigns to every surviving document a definite occasion, a definite purpose, and in almost every case a definite author as well. And once again history can be written. We have the Elder John popping it at Ephesus, with his ultramontane jackal Gaius to spread his influence further afield (and we regret that Canon Streeter has no kind word for that good Gallican, Diotrophes); we have Aristion, once a lad in Jerusalem, and now Bishop of Smyrna, exhorting the persecuted in Pontus with the letter we have hitherto known as “1 Peter”; we have the Didachist at Antioch helping backward Churches with advice on Church order; we have Ignatius, a monomaniac for episcopacy, wrongly assuming that the Church of Rome must possess a bishop, and by that wrong assumption actually propagating monepiscopacy in the Imperial City itself.

All this is presented with a skill and a wealth of research which makes it extraordinarily good reading. There are lacunæ, of course. The whole synthesis which has created the Elder John as a living person still depends on the highly questionable assumption that the second and third epistles “of John” are by the author of the first; and nothing is done to strengthen the assumption except to refer to the authority of Canon Charles. There are slips here and there. It is unlikely, for example, that Hermas knew the “Two Ways” document (p. 211); and more unlikely still that deuterio-Clement did (p. 247)—the phrase “dead gods” could perfectly well have come from the book of “Wisdom.” The theory that the *Clementines* attack St. Paul under the guise of Simon Magus (p. 8) has now been generally abandoned; Harnack is prepared to throw it overboard, and Eduard Meyer has jettisoned it frankly. Neither of them, again, supports Canon Streeter in his unqualified statement (p. 10) that the idea of Simon’s visit to Rome “originated in a mare’s nest discovered by Justin Martyr.” It is quite clear from Matthew xviii. 18 that “to bind and to loose” means to “exercise discipline,”

and should not be interpreted, either in that passage or in xvi. 19, as "to expound the moral law" alone (p. 59); and, indeed, Canon Streeter himself admits this when on p. 60 he interprets the phrase as "to decide how much of the law the members of the Church shall be *required to observe*"—a very different thing. The phrase "the key of knowledge" has too many gnostic affinities to entitle us offhand to interpret it in a rabbinic sense (p. 59). It is not clear why "few would wish to maintain that Ignatius might at certain moments be in some special sense susceptible to influences from the Divine Spirit" (p. 166);—even though he suffered from a "psychic over-compensation for an inferiority complex" (p. 168) he need not have fallen so low as this. Nor does the fact that he was subject to prophetic seizures show that he was "addicted to trance-practice" (p. 167). Indeed, Canon Streeter has surely missed the whole intention of the passage from *Trallians* v. It is neither, as he supposes, "an unhappy mixture of pride and humility," with no ulterior purpose; nor is it (as Reitzenstein holds) a frank bid for the position of a *pneumatikos*. Reitzenstein has undoubtedly cleared the way for a recognition of its true purpose—it is a considered and definite attack on others who, by reason of "bonds" and "gnosis," claimed to be *pneumatikoi*. The Alexandrianism of deutero-Clement (p. 238) is at best only skin-deep; Canon Streeter has made a point of Hilgenfeld's supposed resemblances between the homily and Clement of Alexandria (p. 245), but he has said nothing of Lightfoot's complete and final rebuttal of the suggestion. The passage in deutero-Clement (c. 14) on which Canon Streeter chiefly relies for this supposed Alexandrianism is almost certainly a quotation from an unknown source or sources. "I do not think you are ignorant . . ." is how Clement introduces it; and in his naïve satisfaction at this excursion into highbrow nonsense ("it is no small counsel, I think, that I give you . . .") he resembles Hermas in his least inspired moments. With Hermas, again, he shows close kinship in his doctrine of Christ as the pre-existent Spirit, in his Encratite leanings, and in his extraordinary preoccupation with sin, punishment, and repentance. The "Roman" hypothesis for the origin of deutero-Clement has better grounds than Canon Streeter allows.

De minimis non disputandum—these are points of little importance. The innumerable readers whom the book will rightly fascinate will argue for long enough about the cruel psychological analysis to which its author subjects the martyr-bishop of Antioch, and we may safely leave them to form their own conclusions. But a word may be said in defence of Hermas. Dibelius' commentary on the *Pastor* has opened a new epoch in

its interpretation; but even apart from this *Hermas* is not a white rabbit. On Canon Streeter's own showing he seems to be the first "non-official" writer of the early Church to be content with using his own name; perhaps the first "non-official" person to dare to address the Church at large at all. He has a clear and definite policy which he means to press home; his book in outline (for no doubt he added to it constantly) develops according to plan to the climax of the completed tower; he stands up to the "*Epistle of the Hebrews*" in a city where it was influential and well known, and he carries the day against it. And if Dibelius is right in thinking the "autobiographical" passages in the main fictitious, *Hermas* shows a just apprehension of what the public wants. He knows that what modern publishers call a strong sex-appeal will get him a hearing; and so he opens with the tale of the bathing lady who bids fair to become the Beatrice of his *Divine Comedy*, until she is ousted by the far more dramatic female figure of the Church. He knows also that intimate personal touches from the author's private life always endear him to the public; and so we have the hints about his unpleasant but only too credible wife, and the shameful and—be it confessed—utterly incredible debauchery of his family. It may be a little cheap, perhaps, but it is at least clever journalism—by no means the work of a white rabbit; and behind it all loom the vivid and portentous figures of the tower and the willow tree, the Shepherd of penitence, the Angel of discipline, and the Lord of the Tower Himself.

There is much that this review must pass over—the ingenious chain of detailed argument and investigation which leads up to the brilliant picture of Aristion in particular. But the fundamental question remains. Are the surviving documents of the period adequate either in number or in content to enable us with the slightest confidence to conjecture the "history" of, let us say, the development of monepiscopacy in the early Church, as Canon Streeter does? Or must we, in the last resort, be content with "tendencies" and nothing more? One curious problem presents itself in connection with Clement of Rome. He wrote at a time when, if we may trust "*Hebrews*" and *Hermas*—and Canon Streeter trusts them fully—the Church of Rome was in the throes of a bitter controversy about discipline. How bitter it was is shown by the earnestness with which both *Hermas* and "*Hebrews*" press their respective cases. And Clement actually took sides in the controversy himself. *Hermas* has no doubt that he will pass on the new message without hesitation; he quotes freely enough from *Hebrews*, *except* from the passages which embody that epistle's most characteristic views; and he offers the Corinthian rebels a chance of penitence

which Hebrews would most emphatically have repudiated. Yet he gives not the barest hint that even a transient doubt, much less a controversy, has been aroused on the subject. He writes as though no one in the world had ever imagined for a moment that a "place for repentance" was not open to the dissidents. The light he throws upon the liturgy of the contemporary Church of Rome is invaluable, though it had no relation whatever to the subject of his letter; but on how many features in the contemporary Church of Rome even germane to his subject (as this question of discipline undoubtedly was) does he throw no light whatever? If he fails to indicate even by the most unconscious gesture the great controversy of his day, may he not have been Bishop of Rome in sober earnest, and yet have failed to indicate that as well? And how far may not the same be true of *Hermas* and *Didaché* and *1 Peter* as well? It is becoming common among theologians to say that we have not material enough to attempt to write a life of our Lord; is it not equally arguable that we have not enough material out of which to compile a history of the primitive Church? We owe Canon Streeter a real debt of gratitude that he should have forced this question upon us in his own absorbing and inimitable fashion.

K. E. KIRK.

NOTICES

THE MAKING OF THE CHRISTIAN MIND. By Gaius Glenn Atkins, D.D. Heinemann. 8s. 6d.

A genial study of Church history. The movements of Christian thought, combining in an ever-developing synthesis, are traced with a wealth of learning and a delightful habit of apposite reference to authorities. The central focus of the book is the Mind of Christ. After the first few chapters the writer detaches particular aspects of the mind of the Church, and traces the development of each separately from the early Church down to the present day. We find ourselves travelling backwards and forwards through Church history again and again. The advantage of the method is that it makes for lucidity. The book is eminently fair and kindly.

There is ripe reflection, shrewd judgment, and keen insight. The central chapters, each of which traverses the whole length of Church history, are concerned with the making of the doctrinal mind, the finding of a Church mind, the religious mind of society, the sacramentarian mind, the mystical mind.

The Reformation is presented as an adventure in liberty, which fettered itself in over-elaboration of doctrine and an insatiate habit of Creed-making. St. Paul was over-valued, and the Mind of Christ insufficiently studied. In the post-Reformation divisions of Christendom, all Christianity has lost Catholicity of spirit—i.e., generous understanding and noble hospitality.

The need of present-day Christianity is to re-explore and to re-interpret the mind of Christ, while maintaining all that is best in its rich and varied inheritance.

The writer ends on a note of sure confidence that God's greatest gifts, in Christ, now, as always, meet man's greatest needs, and that Christianity, with whatever re-associations and re-thinking, will in the future, as in the past, minister the one to the other.

SINICA FRANCISCANA. Vol. I.: Itinera et Relationes Fratrum Minorum Sæculi XIII. et XIV. Collegit, ad fidem codicum relegit et adnotavit P. Anastasius Van den Wyngaert, O.F.M. Pp. i-cxviii; 1-637. 10×7. Quaracchi, apud Coll. S. Bonaventuræ. 1929. 100 lire.

The Franciscan Order have shown wonderful industry of late years in publishing the documents of their great past. Following close on the heels of Golubovich's *Biblioteca Bio-bibliografica della Terra Santa e dell'Oriente Francese* comes the present work, which will deal with Eastern Asia and China only. The first volume gives the complete texts in the original languages of Johannes de Plano Carpini, Benedictus Polonus, Guillelmus de Rubruc, Johannes de Monte Corvino, Peregrinus de Castello, Andreas de Perusia, Odoricus de Portu Naonis, Paschalis de Victoria, Martyrium Fr. Minorum Almaligh, Johannes de Marignolli, Anonymus Hispanus. An exception to the completeness of the texts must be made in the case of the last two authors. It would be ridiculous to print the whole of Marignolli's Chronicle of Bohemia in a book dealing with China. We have here, then, not merely records of Franciscan Missions, but the majority of the important medieval texts on Eastern Asia carefully reprinted from the best manuscripts. At the foot of the page are elaborate critical notes giving the variants of other MSS. or families of MSS., and brief explanatory notes. Each author's work is preceded by a short biographical note, and a list of the MSS. and printed editions. The transcription of the MSS. and the critical editing seem to be very accurately done, with the exception of Monte Corvino's first (Italian) letter, where both text and punctuation have gone curiously astray. Besides a number of small slips we may note: p. 341, "b MS. *ragion*" really applies to p. 340; "ragion" on p. 341 is quite intelligible. P. 341 last line, for "fronde. Dallori . . . poghi fiumi," read "fronde dalbori . . . poghi; fiumi"; p. 343 for "mese. Inn anno una" read "mese innanno. Una." This curious punctuation, which makes the Indians "marry only once a year," has the support of Yule, whose sense of humour seems for once to have forsaken him. P. 343 for "restieno" read "crescieno"; p. 344 for "e per lo" read "e poi lo"; for "i[n] luoghi omnino" read "i luoghi anno." Paragraph 10 on p. 343 seems to be wrongly punctuated throughout. Very careful collation of a large number of pages of the Latin texts reveals, fortunately, no similar errors in them, but the greatest reliability both in text and notes. Of special interest is the text of Odoric, which reproduces the famous Assisi MS. which for many years enjoyed the (groundless) reputation of being the original copy written at Padua in May, 1330. Several learned pages are devoted to the discussion of the various families of the Odoric text, without, however, coming to any very definite conclusion. The author scarcely allows enough individuality to the Hakluyt text, which is represented by good early MSS. in the British

Museum and at Cambridge. The long Introduction contains, besides much other valuable matter, an essay on the missionary methods of Monte Corvino and his colleagues, a new subject which will be of special interest and value in these days of revived missionary interest and scientific study of missionary problems.

Not only students of Franciscan Missions but students of medieval travel and geography will thank P. Van den Wyngaert for having provided them good critical texts of almost all their important Western authors, excepting, of course, Marco Polo. The volume begins with a long list of the MSS. and printed books which the author has used and ends with an admirable index.

A. C. MOULE.

SAINT BERNARD. The Twelve Degrees of Humility and Pride. Translated by Barton R. V. Mills, M.A. S.P.C.K. 6s.

This book deserves a warm welcome both for its own sake and because it helps to rescue the writings of St. Bernard from the neglect into which they have fallen in this country. St. Bernard was probably the greatest preacher and the greatest moral teacher of his day. (A mystic with a sense of humour, a monk with a wide and sympathetic outlook on life, a Religious who was consulted by Pope and Potentate on important questions of Church and State, he was one of the outstanding figures of the Middle Ages.) His tract, "De gradibus humilitatis et superbiae," which appears for the first time in an English translation, is the earliest, and in some respects the most interesting, of his treatises. "It is," says Mr. Mills, "as valuable to the Christian of the twentieth century as it was to the Cistercian of the twelfth" (p. xxi). The translation is prefaced by an introduction giving a brief analysis of the tract, an estimate of St. Bernard as monk, mystic, and moralist, and a useful sketch of life in a Cistercian monastery.

The English version is accurate, idiomatic, and eminently readable. Those who are unacquainted with Latin, for whom the translation was primarily intended, will gain from it an excellent idea of St. Bernard's merits and weaknesses. S.P.C.K. has laid patristic students under a great obligation by the publication of this book, which, it may be added, is well printed in clear type.

H. W. FULFORD.

THE ENGLISH MARTYRS: PAPERS FROM THE SUMMER SCHOOL OF CATHOLIC STUDIES HELD AT CAMBRIDGE, JULY 28 TO AUGUST 6, 1928. Edited by the Rev. Dom Bede Camm, O.S.B. Heffer and Sons. 7s. 6d.

Approximately two-thirds of this volume is devoted to history—the account of the events of the Reformation in England as seen by and presented to Roman Catholics. This section is opened by Fr. Ronald Knox and concluded by Fr. Harrington. There follow five papers on the actual subject-matter of the volume, as indicated by the title, on the martyrs respectively of the Franciscans, Seculars, Benedictines, Jesuits, and the lay-order.

One's general impression of the book is of a clamorously strident and somewhat vindictive vindication of Roman Catholicism. The book is very definitely polemic. As was suggested above, the actual subject-matter—*The English Martyrs* properly so called—are given about one-third of the compass of the volume. For not a few of them, adequate bio-

graphical material is not at hand, which gives room for pious speculation. The skilful manipulation of conceptions and facts in the first paper develops one conclusion: "Martyrdom, as a theological term, means dying to bear witness to the true religion—which is, as we happen to know, the Catholic religion" (p. 6). The second paper is quite the best historical essay in the volume—Fr. Bede Jarrett's, on "The Relation of Church and State in the Middle Ages." Here is cool presentation of fact and objective development of theory. Abbot Smith's essay is important as describing the process of beatification and canonization. The next, on John Fisher and Thomas More, is the first biography that appears in the volume—sandwiched between eight papers, three preceding and five following, which are professedly historical. The least attractive essay in the volume is that by the Rev. H. Harrington. It is singular how certain awkward matters, such as the papal approval of the projected assassination of Queen Elizabeth, fail of mention; how the story of the Elizabethan conflicts leaves out weighty and relevant factors; how it is all written, not with the historian's purpose of fact-finding and candid presentation, but the controversialist's, of making points and scoring off the other side. So true is this that one could easily reconstruct at least the weak points in the "other side's" argument from the text alone—a text that is "historical" in professed aim.

The later papers, which should have been brilliant characterizations of men who are regarded as martyrs by the Roman Church, are, in the main, disappointing. The book is as a whole much like the opera *Pagliacci*, of which the Prologue is the most impressive and significant feature.

F. GAVIN.

JESUS ACCORDING TO ST. MARK. By W. Lowrie. Longmans. 21s.

The author is Rector of the American Church at Rome and an expert in German theology. This gives us the key to his book. For years a disciple of Schweitzer, and now of Barth, he is also a thorough Churchman. He has reacted strongly from popular American Protestantism, whether Fundamentalist or Liberal. It will be readily understood that his book will satisfy no one. None the less, it has great merits. He is, in his own phrase, "a believing eschatologist." Here, in brief, is how he sees the Life of Jesus.

A young man of Nazareth, who hitherto has attracted no attention, is convinced that He is the Christ and that the Kingdom is at hand. He works miracles and proclaims the Kingdom. He is taken to be Elijah, even up to the Entry into Jerusalem. Almost immediately He realizes that He must enter into glory through suffering and death. From the outset He encounters opposition—there were no golden days in Galilee. The disciples were the best material He could find. Not till nearly the end did they realize whom they were following. Jesus went up to Jerusalem, weary of this faithless generation, filled with nostalgia for His heavenly Father. There are no materials for a biography of Jesus; there is no psychological development, no instruction of the disciples for what was to come—how could there be, when their task would be to proclaim what as yet they knew not?

This, of course, is Schweitzer; Mr. Lowrie finds it compatible with traditional Christianity. He is impenitent in his adherence to *Interimsethik*, in spite of all criticism of the famous phrase. Surely he is right,

and the uniqueness of the Christian life lies just in this, that we are always conscious of living on the brink of eternity. The interim lasts till the end of the world, but we have no right to settle down in it. But to Schweitzer Mr. Lowrie adds Barth. All the time he extols the majesty of God, emphasizing the humanity of Jesus, His form of a servant. Pervading our modern theology is the idea of the splendour of our nature, exemplified by the Incarnation. This is all wrong; the truth is rather its degradation, the humiliation of God's coming in the likeness of *sinful* man. Without much argument it is assumed that the Creed is right and the Gospel record is interpreted in the light of its assertions.

While the chief value of the book lies in the point of view, the details are often wonderfully illuminating. Mr. Lowrie makes no attempt to be impersonal. Why did the bearers of the paralytic man, besides opening the roof, have to *dig it up*? "Perhaps I am the only archæologist that understands what is meant—and I will not tell, because such things seem too trivial . . ." (p. 97).

With regard to the patched cloak—"I am perhaps the only man in the Western world that wears his great-grandfather's overcoat" (p. 145). Such touches liven up a theological work. But Mr. Lowrie does not always distinguish between legitimate liveliness and bad taste, as when he speaks of the little child taken in the arms of Jesus as probably "one of Peter's brats."

A few quotations will show the quality of the book. "Who can forgive sin but God only?" It is ominous to observe that Protestant Christendom nearly unanimously sides with the Scribes against Jesus. "It is as much our duty to forgive the dead as the living." Jesus said to the wind "Shut your mouth," "appropriate to the wind as it was represented in mythological pictures—a head with distended cheeks puffing prodigiously."

W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE.

THE AUTHORITY OF JESUS AND ITS FOUNDATION. A Study in the Four Gospels and the Acts. By Bertram Lee Woolf, Ph.D., M.A., B.Sc., B.D., Professor of New Testament Exegesis, History and Criticism, Hackney and New College, Divinity School, University of London. London: George Allen and Unwin, Ltd. 1929. 12s. 6d. net.

This book represents a thesis for the Doctorate in Philosophy at Edinburgh, now put into book form. It is an attempt to discover the nature and foundations of the authority claimed and exercised by Jesus in His earthly ministry. The materials are drawn from the Gospels and Acts, studied in the light of criticism. The standpoint is that of a thorough-going Liberal Protestantism. It is a careful and scholarly piece of work and deserves attention. The general conclusion reached is that the authority of Jesus over those who heard His living voice was that of a prophet. He based His claim to be heard not on being the Son of God or the Son of Man, or even the Messiah, nor yet on His miracles, but on the appeal of His words, backed by His personality, to the mind and conscience of men.

Granted certain presuppositions, the writer's case is irrefutable. Indeed, few would dispute that to His contemporaries Jesus of Nazareth appeared in the first place to be a prophet. But the evidence is not quite so simple as this book would make out. Dr. Bevan has recently

warned us that almost any estimate of the person of Christ can be supported in the name of scientific criticism of the New Testament. The Gospels do not of themselves supply evidence which compels one conclusion rather than another. This book is a clear example of his contention. Given Liberal Protestant presuppositions, from a critical study of the New Testament emerges a Liberal Protestant Christ. Passages that present difficulties to this view can be explained away or toned down. Certain shades in the picture can be heightened. And on grounds of literary criticism the process can be justified. Thus the writer's treatment of miracle may indeed be right, but it is well to recognize that it rests on certain ultimate views about the universe, not on an unbiassed study of the New Testament. Again, if Jesus assigned a redemptive significance to His death, that at once begins to raise questions about the kind of authority that He claimed. Did He claim to save man simply by what He taught in the widest sense of the word, or by what He did? In spite of the writer's attempt to simplify the problem, it remains true that all the evidence for the life and teaching of Jesus that we possess comes from men who believed that He was a divine Being who came down to earth to save men by dying for them, and as the risen Saviour claimed their grateful obedience.

If space allowed, we should also like to criticize Dr. Woolf's idea of authority, which seems to us to be far too individualistic and pragmatist. And does he really believe that the Catholic doctrine of the Incarnation makes a real temptation impossible? The book emphasizes a side of the truth that orthodoxy has so often neglected, and for this we are grateful. The writer may plead that for scientific purposes he is isolating certain aspects of the problem. Only if we regard the thesis from this standpoint can we regard it with complete satisfaction.

E. J. BICKNELL.

THE CHRIST OF GOD. By S. Parkes Cadman, D.D., LL.D. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1929. 7s. 6d. net.

This book consists of lectures originally delivered before the Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois. They deal with the significance of the person of Christ. The treatment is at times rather scrappy and allusive, but they contain much material for thought and many striking sayings. There is no attempt to formulate a precise theology. Perhaps the most valuable part of the book is where it insists that any attempt to estimate the significance of Christ must approach the question from every possible angle. Study of documents must be supplemented by the experience of disciples and the organic witness of the Christian Church. There is also some telling criticism in very modern terms of recent attempts to deny or minimize the importance of the historical Jesus. The author shows evidence of wide reading and power of selection. The book as a whole is a useful defence of Christian faith.

E. J. BICKNELL.